

THE
QUARTERLY
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

VOLUME IX.—NUMBER IV.

DECEMBER, 1837.

ART. I.—INSTRUCTION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB.

Quatrième Circulaire de l'Institut Royal des Sourds-Muets de Paris, à toutes les Institutions de Sourds-Muets de l'Europe, de l'Amérique et de l'Asie. Paris, 1836. [Fourth Circular of the Royal Institute of Paris, for Deaf and Dumb, to all the Institutions of the Deaf and Dumb, in Europe, America, and Asia. Paris, 1836.]

THE publication cited at the head of this article, is one with which the public in general have not the means of becoming acquainted. This is owing not merely to the circumstance of its being in a foreign language, but still more to the fact, that beyond the sphere in which it is intended to be immediately useful, no effort is made to give it a circulation. It is addressed and transmitted only to the something more than one hundred and forty institutions for the deaf and dumb existing in the world; but embraces, nevertheless, much that is fitted to interest every philanthropist, every psychological inquirer, and every person engaged in the education of the young.

The general design of the work may be inferred from its title; but in regard to the particular manner of its usefulness, a few words of explanation may be necessary. It is a fact generally known, that the art of instructing the deaf and dumb, is far from being one of recent origin; though the period of its introduction into this country is within the recol-

lection of the existing generation, and though the consideration in which it is at present held, has been obtained only in times comparatively modern. Many persons are likewise aware, that there have been not a few competitors to challenge, each for himself, the renown due to the invention of an art so honorable to humanity. They are aware, indeed, that no individual can, in reference to this art, claim for himself exclusively the merit of originality ; but that various persons, acting without concert, and without a knowledge of what had been previously accomplished, did, in different countries and at different periods, devise and practice with success their own peculiar modes of imparting to the deaf, from birth, a knowledge of alphabetic language. They are also, however, equally aware, that the effort to extend, systematically, the blessings of education to all this unfortunate portion of our race, is strictly characteristic of modern benevolence. But it is not in general so well known, that during the two centuries preceding the establishment of the first public institution under the patronage of any government, and indeed for some time after that event, the professors of this art, in various countries on the European continent, sought, for the most part, by mysteriously concealing their processes, to impress the public mind with an exceedingly high estimate of their marvelous discoveries, and to make gain by applying the same in practice. So long as universal concealment was the order of the day ; so long as a mercenary spirit predominated over the dictates of humanity, in the breasts of those who possessed the means of doing good ; so long as every felicitous idea and every ingenious device, was kept cautiously veiled from the world, and no man lighted his lamp save to hide it under a bushel, it was not to be expected, that the art of which we are speaking could make rapid progress towards perfection, nor that, even imperfect as it was, it could reach with its regenerating influences one individual in a thousand of those whom it might have restored to society and happiness.

A new era at length approached. The eighteenth century had more than half passed away. France, usually so ready to respond to the calls of suffering humanity, but so backward to listen to this, had already seen spring up within her limits more than one individual, whose names are now blended with the history of the art, when there arose a man, who, without the glitter of resplendent genius to shed luster upon his career, without resources to purchase, and without power to command the execution of his designs, with little encouragement

from the good, and no patronage from the great, but cheered on and sustained against the sneers of ignorance and the opposition of bigotry, solely by the warm impulses of a heart in which love for his kind predominated over every selfish feeling,—effected an entire revolution in the public sentiment regarding this subject, and threw open to the deaf and dumb of France and of the world, the prospect of a certain, though tardy emancipation from the fetters of ignorance, and consequent degradation.

This man was Charles Michael De l'Épée. To the unreflecting multitude, there may be little to interest, because there is nothing to dazzle, in the life of a meek, unobtruding, self-denying, and self-sacrificing individual. In the noise of battle and the paeans of victory, in the ovation and the triumphal march, there is an outward splendor, which imposes on the senses and stupifies the judgment. Thus the conqueror of nations is hailed with huzzas, and borne along on the shoulders of men whom his battles have made childless. But the conqueror who fights not for thrones and dominions; whose weapons are not the weapons of earthly warfare; whose foes are prejudices deep-rooted in the minds, not of the vulgar only, but of all mankind, and whose victories are the victories of that spirit which breathes good-will to men, must look beyond the world for his reward. As such a warfare cannot be undertaken but by one who copies the example of Him who was meek and lowly, so likewise will its laurels but too often prove, like the diadem which in mockery encircled the brows of his great Captain,—a crown of thorns. But for such a one there are other wreaths, and lovelier chaplets. What though cold neglect attend him here, or persecution mark him for his victim; he knows, that “his light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.”

It is the fate of many a moral conqueror, to be justly esteemed only after he has passed beyond the reach of human praise or blame. The man whose sole support and consolation in life, was found in his own inward consciousness of rectitude, is canonized in death by the common consent of mankind; and the name, which, within a narrow circle of his self-sufficient and short-sighted cotemporaries, was hardly pronounced without a sneer, is revered and hallowed by after-millions to the end of time. So has it been, and will it be, with De l'Épée. However consolatory to him might have been the prospect, he could hardly have foreseen the

grand results of his persevering and disinterested efforts ; yet already are they felt over half the civilized world, already have they caused the hearts of thousands of afflicted parents to leap for joy, and already have they proved the means of restoring to this world, and to the knowledge of a better, a multitude of intelligent beings, as capable of joining in the song of the redeemed, as those whose voices have been tuned to music here, by the mysteriously discriminating blessing of heaven.

From the time of De l'Epée, a new policy began to prevail in regard to the art we are considering. The veil of mystery which had so long shrouded its processes, was drawn aside ; and all men were permitted, and not only permitted but urged, to avail themselves of the knowledge then first promulgated, and to assist in securing its application so extensively as to meet all the exigencies of the unfortunate, to whom it proposed to bring relief. Appeals were made to governments for aid ; and here and there began to spring up individuals, who, like De l'Epée, seemed rather to live for their fellow-men than for themselves. From the school of that estimable philanthropist, went forth others, to carry the knowledge and the practice of the art to other cities and other countries. Indeed, the highest earthly ambition of that excellent man, seems to have been to interest the friends of humanity, everywhere, in a cause to which he had devoted his own life and all that he possessed ; and to engage them actively in the dissemination of light among a class of intelligent beings, who were then, and who are, for the most part, even now, so emphatically sitting in darkness. Still for thirty years did he behold himself doomed to labor on unaided, amid embarrassments under which any but he, and the few rare spirits whom the world has produced like him, would have deemed it vain to strive. He was accustomed, at times, to deny to himself the common necessities of life, for the benefit of those whom he had made the recipients of his bounty. It is even recorded, that, on one occasion, at an advanced age, and in a season of severe weather, he chose rather to dispense with the essential comfort of a fire, than to abstract, for the sake of procuring it, anything from the sum which he had appropriated to the support of his school. Nor was it until after he had been solicited with tears by the pupils who loved him with affection more than filial, that he was persuaded to allow himself an indulgence, which, to use his own words, he could only purchase by robbing them. It was not until after his death, that the school of which he had been the founder, and which he had so long sustained by his

individual means, was adopted by the government of France, under the title of the Royal Institution of Paris.

The history of the art of instructing the deaf and dumb, is divided by Baron Degerando, the author of the most extensive and philosophical work which has yet appeared on the subject, in any country, into two periods, widely distinguished from each other in regard to the spirit by which its professors seem to have been animated. The appearance of *De l'Épée*, about the year 1760, is assumed as the point of division between the two. Since that time, there has grown up among instructors, a kind and fraternal feeling. The disposition has become general to make the discoveries and improvements originated by each individual, the common property of all. Instructors have sought each other's schools with a single desire for personal improvement; they have read each other's works in a spirit of candor; and when individuals have felt themselves compelled to differ, their controversies, though animated, have usually been conducted with courtesy and fairness, and characterized by a controlling desire to arrive at the truth. But it is evident, that, widely separated from each other as schools of this description have been, and various as have been the languages in which opposing views have been published to the world, immense obstacles have, of necessity, impeded facility of intercourse, and consequently retarded, at once, the general march of improvement, and the gradual but sure approach to unanimity of opinion among instructors.

To overcome these obstacles, it was a happy idea, originating some ten years since with the Royal Institution of Paris, to establish a system of correspondence, by means of which every institution in the world might be made acquainted with the views of every other. Of this system, it was proposed to make the Royal Institution, at once, the centre and the organ of communication. It was the principal feature in the plan suggested, to publish biennially at Paris a circular, to which every instructor should be invited to become a contributor, as the most direct means of addressing himself at once to all his fellow-laborers in the common cause. The Royal Institution, on its own part, undertook to embody in the same publication, a condensed view of the actual state of every existing institution, according to the most recent information; to present a concise account of all the researches made in regard to the causes and the possible cure of deafness, and to subjoin to the whole a candid analysis of every work which might appear, in any language, directly or indirectly bearing upon the art.

This suggestion had been no sooner made, than it was everywhere hailed with unqualified satisfaction. No time was lost in carrying it into execution. Three circulars have made their appearance in past years, and the fourth is now before us, in the imposing form of an octavo of four hundred and ninety pages. From the magnitude of the work, may be naturally enough inferred its value and importance : for, were the same information and the same argumentations to be left to make their way through the ordinary channels of communication, it is evident, that the progress of improvement, and the tendency to unanimity on essential points, must be materially retarded.

To examine critically in review the contents of the work of which we have thus explained the purpose and the general character, and to assign our reasons for according in opinion with the views put forth upon one page, or for dissenting from those expressed in another, would be hardly consistent with the character of this journal, and would render our remarks devoid of interest to most of our readers. Connected, however, as is the volume before us with the history of the art we are considering, and constituting as it does in itself the feature perhaps the most strikingly distinctive of the same history in later times, its appearance furnishes us with an opportunity for explaining, with something more of minuteness than has yet been done in this country, by what characteristic differences the efforts recently made to advance the art of instructing the deaf and dumb, are distinguished from those which marked the earlier period of the history ; and in doing so, possibly at the same time to answer some of the interrogatories which most usually suggest themselves to inquirers, in regard to the details of the art itself.

In reverting to the labors of the early teachers, and in endeavoring intelligibly to explain in what they consisted, it will be necessary to indicate and describe those mechanical means of supplying for deaf-mutes the want of oral language, commonly called instruments of instruction. In doing this, we shall but do what has already been done, more or less fully, in some of our periodical journals : yet we cannot avoid the necessity, and still continue to make ourselves understood.

The earlier instructors seem, indeed, to have founded systems of instruction with the mere instruments of communication ; and to have imagined, that they were bringing their art to a state of perfection, precisely in proportion as they were able to perfect for the deaf and dumb, a method of employing

alphabetic language independent of sound. The later instructors, on the contrary, have regarded the perfection of the means of communication as an essential, certainly, but not as constituting in itself the grand object to be accomplished. They have turned their attention to the *matter* to be communicated, and have found in the complexity of language, the wide range of ideas of which its elements are the representatives, and the endless variety of departures from all fixed rule which its idioms present, and which usage has sanctioned, a subject demanding much more laborious investigation, and much more patient study on the part of one who would reduce these things to method, and arrange their difficulties in a progressive order, than any elaboration of the mere mechanical means of communication can require. Between the teacher of speaking children and his pupils, there exists already a medium of communication, which leaves nothing to be desired: yet he is perfectly aware, that the success of his instruction is dependent, in a high degree, upon the method according to which he presents successively the difficulties inherent in the subject to be taught. Moreover, one chief merit of a good textbook for learners, in whatever department of knowledge, consists in the judicious arrangement of the several subordinate topics embraced under the general head denoted by its title.

That which, for every class of learners, is a matter so highly important, and even so indispensable to the clearness of their ideas and the accuracy of the knowledge which they acquire, is pre-eminently thus for the deaf and dumb. These may be taught, and taught too with astonishing success, by one whose acquaintance with their ordinary means of communication is imperfect, or whose facility in its employment is small: but no perfection in the use of this means, can compensate for the absence of methodical arrangement in the details of the subject upon which it is to be exercised.

To return, then, to the instruments of instruction. It is proper, in the first place, to remark, that a notion, highly erroneous, seems extensively to prevail, regarding the medium through which the mutual intercourse between teachers of the deaf and dumb and their pupils, is commonly carried on. The finger-alphabet is believed to constitute for this class of persons, at least when they are not taught to articulate, the basis of the language of ordinary conversation, and of the schools. Having ourselves once labored under a similar error, we can readily perceive how easy it is so to err. We may presume the prevalent impression to have arisen from the fact,

that, in this country, educated deaf-mutes, when thrown into contact with strangers, usually resort to one of two modes of communicating their ideas. The first is simply to write ; and the second, to spell words *literatim* on the fingers. In writing, there is nothing which other persons are not observed to do as well, but in the use of the manual alphabet, (the practice of the art of *dactylology*, as it is called,) there is something peculiar ; and this being the only prominent peculiarity, is easily conceived to be the distinguishing peculiarity of the deaf and dumb. A little reflection would show the impossibility involved in such a supposition. The manual alphabet is but a means of presenting words under a visible form. Writing is another means of doing the same ; but neither writing a word, nor spelling it on the fingers, affords any clew to its meaning. The word must be taught by means independent of both these processes : and if it were demanded of us as teachers of the deaf and dumb, to arrange a system of instruction of the highest practicable degree of simplicity, the very first among the subordinate auxiliaries with whose assistance we should be willing to dispense, would be the manual alphabet. We speak of this instrument here strictly in regard to its importance as a means of instruction, and not to its convenience in use after the purposes of instruction have been accomplished. That it might be rejected with no material disadvantage thus far, is obvious to every intelligent instructor. It is even furthermore believed, that some important advantages might result from its exclusion, at least during the earlier period of the course of instruction.

The instruments of communication essential, however, to the success of an instructor, are such as, antecedently to any acquaintance with alphabetic language, address themselves directly to the understanding of the pupil. They must have their origin in that primitive intellectual phenomenon denominated *intuition*—the act by which the mind immediately contemplates the objects of its knowledge. In other words, our first efforts to address the intelligence of an uninstructed deaf-mute, must be to place actually before him the objects of which we would have him think, or to recall their images to his memory, by some species of imitation. Language cannot be to him what it is to us, a machine, but rather a picture.

Hence, obviously, the art of design, or drawing, will afford to the instructor important resources in the prosecution of his task. So true is this, that design has even been made the basis of a system of instruction. Immediately before De

l'Epée, in Paris, appeared a teacher of deaf-mutes, called Father Vanin, who rested entirely upon pictures for the interpretation of all matters, however simple or however abstruse.

But the grand instrument of instruction under all circumstances, must be found in pantomimic action. Many persons are already aware, though very many others are not, that pantomime is brought by the deaf and dumb to so high a state of perfection, as to fulfill for them all the purposes which oral language subserves for the rest of the world. And many who are acquainted with the general fact, that pantomime is the natural language of the deaf from birth, are still unprepared to hear, that, for all the ordinary topics of life, the news of the day, and the discussion of questions, whether of fact or of opinion, relating to the matters in which mankind are most immediately interested—to business, for example, to economy, to politics, to morals, and religion—this language of action affords a medium of communication, as clear and as rapid as speech itself. When employed upon unusual subjects, or the nice discussion of matters purely abstract, it frequently exacts greater circumlocution, consumes of course a greater amount of time, and is attended with less precision : but this disadvantage is compensated, on the other hand, by the fact, that, in regard to the simplest matters—to those of which there is of course the most frequent occasion to speak—the sign-language, as it is called, outstrips even the rapidity of oral communication. Some have claimed for this language altogether too much ; others, on the contrary, have denied to it the consideration which is justly its due. We will attend first to what it is, and afterward consider the scope of its power.

The expressions of human passion and emotion can rarely be mistaken. Admiration, anger, fear, contempt, joy, sorrow, &c., portray themselves too strongly in the countenance and in the manner to be confounded. The simpler mental operations are likewise accompanied by corresponding expressions equally distinctive. Thought and recollection, doubt and determination, attention and comparison, will almost invariably be recognized by their outward visible manifestations. Thus far the elements of pantomime are familiar to all. And not only so, but they are involuntarily employed by persons of lively temperament when merely naming or describing the feelings or the intellectual processes to which they correspond. To such auxiliaries is owing much of the power of the accomplished advocate : and their effect has not a little to do with the manifest difference we so often perceive between the im-

pressions excited by a printed discourse, and those produced by the same discourse taken up from the lips of the orator. To the power of depicting the feelings in action, the tragedian chiefly owes his success in moving the hearts of men. He employs it, indeed, only as an auxiliary, intended to carry home to the heart through the eye, as his just elocution is designed to do through the ear, the sentiment of the words which he utters. But we need only picture to ourselves in imagination the same individual uttering the same sentiments with the same intonations, but with a countenance exhibiting the changeless features of a statue, in order to be convinced, that the words of Demosthenes are true, and that action is, after all, the real secret of a public speaker's power.

The gesticulation, which, combined with physiognomical expression, constitutes for the deaf and dumb the sign of any emotion, consists in the imitation of those actions to which the emotion naturally prompts. Thus love impels us to clasp, and hatred to repel, its object. Desire leads to extend the hands, with the effort to grasp the object desired. Selfishness prompts to draw closely to the person whatever we may fear to lose. Fear manifests itself in starting, trembling, and assuming the attitude of flight. Despair occasions the irregular and convulsive throwing of the hands about, beating of the head, and twining of the fingers in the hair. Such gesticulation is often important to distinguish between different emotions analogous in their nature.

But we are creatures of thought and reflection, as well as of feeling and passion; and none but the simpler operations of the mind admit of a simple expression in the countenance. Moreover, we are surrounded by a material world, and with the objects which it contains, are, in one way or another, intertwined by far the greater part of our ideas and our emotions. Merely to exhibit feeling, is not to tell why we feel; and to seem absorbed in thought, is not to explain of what we are thinking. A language must embrace the signs of things external to ourselves, and of those purely intellectual conceptions which have no visible counterparts. Nor is it sufficient to constitute a language, that the signs of ideas merely should exist. There must be likewise certain laws of combination, by which the relations of things to one another may be indicated—there must be some species of syntax. We will confine our attention, first, to the individual signs.

It may, however, be remarked in the outset, that the elements of the sign-language unmodified by art, are far from

corresponding strictly to words. A vast portion, on the other hand, of the words of spoken language, can be severally translated into no individual sign, but require each a combination of several signs of a more elementary character. These elements may perhaps sometimes have corresponding words; but they often combine in a manner of which the same words are incapable. The reason of this is, partly, the fact, that signs in general have no fixed grammatical character: so that, though they correspond in their radical sense to particular words, they are not trammelled in their modes of use by the laws to which those words are subject. It would, therefore, as a general rule, be impossible to translate a proposition put forth in signs of action, literally into spoken language: and this would still be true, were it not a fact, that the order of construction, as well as the manner of combination, which words require, is entirely at variance with that exacted by signs of action. In seeking to understand, therefore, the language of the uninstructed deaf and dumb, we must discard the notion, that the form of our own language is in any manner to serve us as a guide: and in seeking to express ourselves by means of pantomimic action, we must keep out of view, as much as possible, the verbal expressions, which, in similar circumstances, we should naturally adopt. We must analyze the ideas we mean to convey, decompose them to their simplest elements, and endeavor to find a suitable representative, not for the entire group which a word might express, but for each element of the group singly. We must endeavor to carry ourselves back to the period, if such a period ever existed, when men were without a language, and to look, as men in such circumstances must look, not to the symbols of things, but to things themselves.

To illustrate our meaning: The pen with which we write, suggests the subject for a sign. A single word is sufficient to denote this object; but not a single sign. We might imitate the action of writing, but this alone would fail to define the idea. Such a sign would correspond only to the verb *to write*: it affords us but one of the elements of the more complex sign descriptive of a pen. We must more or less concisely indicate the form of the object; and this may be done by holding an imaginary pen between the thumb and index of the left hand, while we slide the same members of the right apparently along its length in the air. To distinguish it farther from a pencil, we may imitate the action of dipping into the ink.

This, for ordinary purposes, is sufficient, and more than sufficient, to denote the object intended ; for it must be remembered, that the sign-language admits of elipsis indefinitely. Many elementary ideas are commonly fixed by the connection merely of the signs employed, and require, therefore, no actual expression. But when, whether in consequence of the dullness of the person addressed, or his disposition to pervert our meaning, it becomes necessary to define with positiveness the object intended, we may be compelled to go still farther. The next step would naturally be, to refer to the fowl which supplies us with the article, to imitate the actions of plucking a quill from the wing, of trimming the feather, and of cutting and nibbling the point designed for writing ; and finally, to subjoin to the whole the signs mentioned above. No deaf-mute, who had ever seen the object, could pretend not to understand this ; nor, hardly in fact, could any other person.

But it will be observed, that in this explanation we introduce another object, which has itself no simple sign in the natural language. The means of recalling to the mind the bird from which the quill is obtained, will appear from the remarks we are about to subjoin on the general principles of sign-making. A minute description of the goose would involve the necessity of imitating its actions ; for example, of flying, swimming, waddling, hissing, &c. ; representing the fashion of its feet, the form of its bill, and roughly measuring its height between the hands. In the common colloquial language employed in the institutions of this country, a rude imitation of the bill, made by placing the first two fingers and the thumb before the lips, is all that is necessary to recall the object to mind.

It appears, therefore, that the number of individual signs necessary in pantomimic communication, is variable, according to circumstances, and that it bears no proportion whatever to the number of words proper to be used in their stead. So far as the language of action is strictly natural, each of its signs represents some elementary idea.

To proceed, now, with our account of this language in general. Signs for material things first demand our attention. In order to recall ideas of these, our resources are numerous. Configuration, color, motion, weight, size, consistency, feeling, (to the touch,) temperature, rapidity, odor, value, materials, purpose or use, manner of production, process of manufacture, seasons to which objects belong, or dates to which we wish to refer them, changes which they undergo, manner of destruction or injury, and sources of harm, situation or place of de-

posit, and, in regard to living beings, their actions, habits, habitations, manner of usefulness, or of annoyance to man, &c., &c., all present themselves to our choice. It is not to be supposed, that every object will be described in reference to each of these particulars; but that those peculiarities in each which are its most striking characteristics, will be brought out in the representation.

There is no difficulty in perceiving, that an object thus described may be recognized: still it may be inquired, how are these elements to be expressed?

The *forms* of objects, in the first place, are to be figured out in the air, or on a table, with the index-fingers of both hands, or with the hands themselves. Occasionally the hand, the arm, or a finger, may be assumed to stand in place of the object, and the peculiarities of form drawn around it: but this in many cases renders the gesticulation more difficult, without contributing to its clearness.

In making signs for *colors* in the natural language, we must call to our aid objects the colors of which correspond. The most expressive mode of doing this, is to pass the tip of the finger lightly and quickly over the surface of such an object, and then to examine it as if with expectation of finding a stain. An inquiring glance directed at the person addressed, will immediately be answered by a nod, signifying that the sign is understood. To denote that the color belongs to some object of which we are conversing, the hand must in the same connection be passed over the imaginary surface of that object.

But colors are not always present when we wish for them. The lip indeed affords the means of denoting red; the bosom or the wristband, white; and the shoe, black. The clothing may sometimes furnish other colors. In the natural language of action, we have no remedy for this defect, but to recall by other signs some known object of suitable color, and cause to be inferred the purpose for which it is recalled, by generalizing the notion of color from an enumeration of such as are present. But the colloquial language prevalent among communities of the deaf and dumb admits here, as in other instances, conventional modes of supplying the deficiency. Thus, though the bosom is not always white, still the invariable sign for that color consists in bringing together the thumb and fingers there, and drawing them away. The eye-brow is usually dark, and a reference to this serves to recall the idea of black, without subjecting us to the awkwardness of stooping to reach the foot. The lip still serves for red; but for blue, green, and yellow,

the signs employed are wholly arbitrary, being nearly the initial letters of those words formed upon the hand, accompanied with a tremulous motion. For other colors, or mixtures, the signs are less simple, because the ideas themselves are generally so, because they are less frequently mentioned, and because the colloquial sign-language of schools, though more perfect than the natural language we are describing, still is very imperfect.

The *motions* of objects sometimes admits of being closely imitated: at other times our imitations are approximations merely, and call up the idea intended by analogy. For the motion of walking, we may actually walk; but for that of flying, we should find it difficult to fly. Walking is, however, commonly represented by means of the hands instead of the feet; and the same is true of many signs connected with the lower extremities. Flying is imitated by raising the hands with the palms downward toward the shoulders, and giving a quick vibratory motion to the fingers. An undulatory motion of the hands very well represents the waving of water: and this, followed by what may be called a rippling motion of the fingers, similar to that employed in a rapid performance on a keyed instrument, will convey an idea of a stream or current. The motion and form of a vessel may be represented at once, the hands being joined at the lower edge. Most of the actions of man may be literally imitated; and, indeed, most other forms of motion may, with the help of a very little ingenuity, and an equal share of self-confidence, be represented by any body, with sufficient of resemblance to recall the idea to the mind of another, whether he is familiar with pantomime or not.

The radical sign employed in conveying the idea of *weight*, is the act of lifting. Great weight is expressed by this action performed with difficulty. Lesser weights require less apparent effort: and, finally, levity is signified by the act of tossing with one or both hands. Extreme tenuity may be represented by puffing the imaginary light body from the hand into the air.

To denote *size*, the hands are to be placed more or less distant from each other. Great size requires the aid of the eye apparently to explain the limits of the object, while the hands are slowly drawn apart to the extreme limit. Minuteness is signified by moving the thumb-nail in contact with the tip of one of the fingers. It may be here observed, that the expression or emphasis of the countenance has much to do with the

force of these particular signs, as, in truth, of all the others: but the precise expression required hardly admits of a description; neither is any required, since this part of pantomime is always the suggestion of nature. The experimenter should constantly bear in mind, however, that this language becomes no language at all, so soon as it is reduced to a mere system of gestures. Whoever employs it, must direct his undivided attention to the matter which he wishes to impart, and be animated while in action solely by the desire to be intelligible. Then nature will come to his aid, and light up a meaning in his countenance which he who runs may read. But if he allows his mind to occupy itself with the consideration of how well or how ill he is acquitting himself, or of how gracefully or how awkwardly he is executing the gesticulations prescribed, or even if he imagines that his success is in any great measure to depend on the vigorous exactness of the gestures, or if he commits the error of supposing, that others are busying themselves rather with the manner than with the matter of his discourse, he will be very likely to fail: for a blunderer in gesticulation merely, whose countenance speaks while his hands are sinning against the rules, will be understood in spite of his awkwardness; while, on the other hand, no degree of grace or accuracy of gesture can compensate for the absence of that language of the features, of which the gestures are after all but subordinate interpreters.

The *consistency* of bodies is another means of recalling them to mind. Fluidity may be signified by pouring, and the particular fluid defined by describing the form of the vessel in which it is kept, by referring to its color, its uses, &c. Tenacity in fluids is very easily denoted by its effects in causing them to adhere to the fingers, or to draw out in the form of a string. Striking the back of one hand with the knuckles of the other, signifies hardness. Bringing the fingers together, as if in the act of pressing a sponge, denotes softness. Plasticity, malleability, brittleness, &c., can hardly prove a source of difficulty to any one.

The act of tasting, performed in the manner of a connoisseur, is radical in all signs denoting rapidity. Sweetness is signified by drawing the fingers downward across the lips with an expression of pleasure. Acidity, by touching the tip of the finger to the tongue or lips, with the sudden start and movement of the eye-lids consequent on the sensation produced by the quality of sharpness. Indeed, most signs of this descrip-

tion, as well as those of odors, have their chief expression in the countenance.

The radical sign expressive of *value*, is that of money. This is derived from the art of passing specie from hand to hand in counting. To this sign we subjoin one of size, used here metaphorically for amount. Thus we have great value, moderate value, little value, &c. Insignificance or want of value is denoted by striking the fingers of the left hand, in a contemptuous manner, with the right hand, as if to put them out of the way.

The *materials* composing the substance of a thing may also be mentioned in the pantomimic description. This will best be done by pointing to some thing which the materials resemble. Wood, in some form or other, is usually at hand. But this may be denoted by the sign of a tree, made by setting the fore-arm upright, and giving the hand a vibratory or a tremulous motion; and afterward imitating the actions of cutting down, chopping, sawing, splitting, &c. In the colloquial language of the institutions, the act of sawing performed with one hand upon the opposite arm, is the concise sign for wood. The general sign for metal is derived from its malleability. The species of metal is denoted by its color, weight, value, uses, &c. Thus of gold and silver are made watches, jewelry, and money; of iron, nails, stoves, &c. Gold is yellow, silver white, iron black. Reference to the clothing signifies cloth: or better, the action of unrolling, measuring, and cutting. Paper is described by representing its thinness and flexibility, and by the act of tearing. Stone is represented as something hard and heavy, something which we pick up and throw, which we find composing rocks, and which is cut with chisels, or bored and blasted. Brick is described by reference to its shape and color, the acts of cutting with a trowel, laying, &c. To denote bone, we refer to the tooth or the bones of the fingers. For ivory, we imitate the motion of an elephant's trunk, and represent the tusks. These illustrations will suffice.

Among the best means of recalling objects to the mind, will be found the *uses* to which they are appropriated. These may often be indicated with much simplicity. The use of a chair, a sofa, a bed, a book, a pen, a musical instrument, a gun, any of the various tools belonging to the mechanic arts, &c. &c., may be represented in action by any person.

The mode of *construction*, or processes of *manufacture* of objects of use, afford also a significant means of denoting them. The action of a cooper in hooping a barrel, of a weaver in

passing the shuttle, of a tailor in measuring, cutting, and sewing, of a joiner in hewing a stick or digging a mortice, are illustrations. Though we here instance but a single act in the process of constructing any object, the entire process may, if necessary, be described by imitation in detail.

The *production* of vegetables affords a means of denoting them by signs. Sprouting from the ground is represented by passing the fingers of the right hand upward through the left. The opening of blossoms may be signified by bringing all the fingers of both hands together, and causing them gradually to diverge. The attention paid to the cultivation of vegetables, fruits, flowers, different kinds of grain, &c., supplies a means in combination with other characteristics, of distinguishing these things from one another.

We find in the *natural changes* of objects, also, a useful source of description. Growth is represented by raising the opened hand gradually higher and higher, or, in the case of fruits, by indicating their size, and making it gradually larger. To denote change in general, the right hand is placed a little above the left, both being horizontal and opened toward each other; and both are turned at once, until the left comes above the right. In representing a particular change, this sign is commonly interposed between the description of the antecedent and that of the subsequent state.

For the means of recalling *seasons* or *dates*, we must resort to the signs employed to express time. An object is often made definite by referring it to some date when it is known to have been observed.

A day is measured by carrying the hand over in a semicircle, as if following the apparent motion of the sun. To signify morning, the right hand is passed upward behind the left arm, in imitation of the sun's rising. Evening is represented by passing the hand downward in like manner. Moving the hands closely before the eyes, denotes darkness, and, by consequence night. Present time is expressed by presenting the hands immediately before the person, palms upward; past time, by throwing the right hand backward over the shoulder; and future time by carrying the same hand forward. Any number of days past or future, may easily be expressed by counting the number of intervening *sleeps*, or nights; any number of weeks, by counting the number of sabbaths, denoted by the natural sign of devotion or prayer, joined to that of day. The seasons are denoted by their temperatures, the agricultural operations belonging to them, the sprouting of

vegetation, the falling of the leaf, and other similar characteristics.

But our limits forbid us to carry out the purpose with which we begun ; which was to illustrate in brief, the mode in which the uneducated deaf and dumb avail themselves, in the endeavor to communicate their ideas of each of the general properties entering into the constitution of physical objects, and of each of the circumstances by which those objects are in any manner affected, or with which they are associated ; as well as of the habits, actions and modes of usefulness, or the contrary, of the various objects of animated nature. We have already allowed ourselves to dwell longer on this branch of the subject, than its relative importance might seem to justify, but for the fact, that, in passing beyond the range of material things, and endeavoring to convey some idea of the manner in which the language of action may be employed to express notions purely intellectual, we shall hardly find it practicable to classify so methodically, either the elementary ideas themselves, or the sources from which our means of representing them must be taken. Another justification may be drawn from the consideration, that, inasmuch as the sign-language is a language of description, of imitation, almost of painting,—and inasmuch as its signs, since they address themselves to the intellect merely through the senses, must therefore be the pictures of only such things as are palpable to sense,—whatever power, consequently, this language possesses, of awakening ideas foreign to the world of matter, must be inferential entirely from its efficiency within that limit. No one, of course, is in a condition to comprehend the second mode of the usefulness of pantomime, who is not already acquainted with the first.

We may remark, then, that however extensive may be the domain through which the human intellect is permitted to range, it presents everywhere a surface continuous and unbroken ; and that however widely in their nature the material and immaterial may differ, they are, nevertheless, bound together by a thousand natural ties. If we take in the whole circle of those ideas which we should find it impossible to depict to the sight, we shall perceive, that there exists a regular scale of gradation, from the very confines of the physical world itself up to those purely intellectual notions whose existence is entirely independent of matter. Without even departing from the world of sense, we find in those generalizations at which we arrive by a comparison of material things, the first step toward the establishment of a system of ideas, which cannot be visibly

portrayed. The abstractions of physical qualities carry us a step higher. Propensities, feelings, sentiments, and moral and intellectual qualities and acts, viewed in connection with the objects to which they appertain, belong to another grade in the scale. These things considered in the abstract, advance us into the very heart of what is denominated the intellectual world. Finally, ideas such as time and space, which exist not as attributes either of mind or of matter, bring us to the extreme limit of our intellectual range. And in regard even to this latter class of ideas, though not allied to matter, they are essential to its being, insomuch, that we become acquainted with them only through our knowledge of our own existence, and of that of the material objects by which we are surrounded.

From this connection of the world of matter with that of mind proceeds chiefly the power of the language of action to awaken ideas, which, in the nature of things, it cannot depict. This power is strengthened by the analogies existing between physical actions and the operations of the intellect, and between intellectual operations of which material things are the objects, and those which have to do with objects purely intellectual.

To classify material things, and to establish genuine notions regarding them, we have but to exhibit in detail the individuals to be embraced in the class, and to point out the resemblances on which the classification rests. Nor is it necessary to enumerate all the individuals, but only a sufficient number to constitute for the person addressed the basis of an induction.

To convey the idea of an abstract physical quality, we have but to point out the quality distinctly in the object, and then by a figurative action, to seem to draw it away and convey it to the forehead, the throne of the intellect, closing or covering the eyes, as if to shut out all perception of material things. This is only a brief and imperfect description of the process, but it embraces its most essential part.

All feelings and propensities are referred to the heart; and the general sign of feeling consists in that slight shrinking which naturally follows the presentation of a pointed object to the breast. The particular kind of feeling must be expressed in the countenance, and in the imitation of those actions to which that species of feeling naturally prompts; but if these fail, then it will be necessary to portray in action, the scenes and the causes by which it would be naturally excited. Moral qualities must be described by the representation of the actions to which they prompt, or of the course of conduct which they

inspire. Intellectual qualities by the powers which they confer, exhibited in their results. The abstraction of these things is affected by a process analogous to that described when speaking of qualities strictly physical.

The last class of ideas enumerated above, is a source of difficulty comparatively small, from the fact, that they are generally simple, (that is, uncompounded,) and moreover, from the circumstance, that they must have an existence in every intelligent mind, on its introduction to a world of matter. Space, infinity, time—the difficulty is to escape from these notions. In order to recall them, we have but to present the facts to the existence of which they were essential. Let us put any individual, for example, upon the task of conceiving a limit to the universe. He will find the undertaking an impossibility, and will be conscious of possessing all the notions of infinite extension, of which the human mind is capable.

It is not pretended, that the several comprehensive classes into which we have disposed the ideas appertaining to the intellectual world, present so many groups of which each individual member is on a par with all the rest, in point of difficulty of expression. Nor is it here pretended, to do more than to point out the possibility, by means of signs of action, to awaken such ideas in a mind unaccustomed to conceive them. There are wide differences among those assigned to each of the classes, in point of complexity; and those, of course, will be the most difficult of expression, which involve the greatest number of elements. Moreover, there are subordinate gradations which it is hardly necessary to notice. Government, for example, which is a complex abstraction, stands at the third remove from the agent *man*. We have, first, *governor*, then the act to *govern*, and finally the abstract idea of *government*.

Nor have we room here to present, as we had intended, any illustrations of that species of metaphoric pantomime, by which the processes we have just now sketched in outline, are often materially abridged; or by which the ideas, when awakened, are often concisely denoted. We have, perhaps, already trespassed too long on the patience of our readers.

It remains only to add, that, in the communities of the deaf and dumb, the strictly natural language which we have been endeavoring to describe, constitutes but the basis of a much more concise medium of communication in common use. Instead of describing minutely a physical object or action, deaf-mutes so situated, fix upon some single characteristic, which

alone stands as its representative. Such signs are called signs of reduction. In different institutions, they are often found to differ widely. Signs founded on metaphor or analogies, are also employed to a considerable extent to represent abstractions, or intellectual and moral qualities and actions. Arbitrary signs also, to a considerable extent, creep in, and individual persons are denoted by reference to some peculiarity, or by some simple sign adopted because it differs from those applied to other individuals. Thus the sign-language, though losing in part its natural character, becomes a rapid and easy means of communication.

The laws of construction, by which the combination of signs is regulated in practice, are few and simple. The object of an action precedes, instead of following the action itself, or the agent by which it is performed. Transition is expressed, when not necessarily implied in the nature of the signs used, by the act of *carrying over* or *giving*. Attributive and definitive signs follow the objects to which they belong. Signs used to connect propositions, answering for the time the purpose of conjunctions, generally follow the clauses, which, in written language, they would precede. Those which denote relations between individual objects, whether in regard to place, time, or causation, follow the signs of the objects themselves. These are the principal outlines of the syntax by which this language is characterized.

One word now regarding the conflicting views which have been expressed as to the *power* of pantomimic action. We have already stated in brief, how far this means of communication may be supposed to supply the want of speech to the communities among which it prevails. But the language of deaf-mutes has been assumed by some to be a language intelligible at sight to all mankind, and constituting, therefore, the desideratum of a universal medium of communication. If this assertion is confined to what we have endeavored to describe as the strictly *natural* language of pantomime, it is true; but it must be obvious, that such a language would be so encumbered by the number and weight of its own elements, as to prove but a slow and laborious means of communicating thought. On the other hand, if, by reduction, it is brought to the form in which we find it in the institutions for the deaf and dumb, it ceases, in consequence of its abbreviations, to be universally intelligible, precisely in proportion as its usefulness is increased.

So important an instrument in the instruction of deaf-mutes, and one already so familiar to them, as the language of action,

could hardly fail to occupy the minds of teachers with the scheme of effecting, not through its use merely, but through its modification, some remarkable improvement in the means of imparting to their pupils a knowledge of alphabetic language. It occurred to the Abbé De l'Epée, that if,—by arbitrarily multiplying its signs, until they should be equal in number to the words to be taught, by giving them a character more strictly grammatical; discarding their natural laws of combination, and introducing among them a new syntax,—he could render this language a counterpart to that of speech, in all save the employment of alphabetic elements, the process of instruction would be reduced to a mere substitution of one set of symbols for another—a literal translation from signs to words. Kerger, a teacher of Liegnitz, in Silesia, near the beginning of the eighteenth century, entertained views not widely dissimilar to these. The Abbé De l'Epée found the execution of his project too difficult to be prosecuted to its completion; but his successor, the Abbé Sicard, followed out the idea with enthusiasm, and reduced it perhaps as strictly to practice as it is possible to do. To teach a language of arbitrary signs, however, which is in itself, to all intents and purposes, but another form of the language of speech, proved to be no less difficult than the undertaking it was intended to facilitate. The sign-language, under its new form, ceased to be to the pupil an intelligible medium of communication. While, therefore, it was employed in the mere dictation of words in the school-room, the natural language continued to be the language of instruction and of conversation. The system of De l'Epée and Sicard is, at the present time, for the most part, abandoned.

We have already expressed the opinion, that pantomimic action is, and must be, the fundamental and efficient instrument in every system of deaf-mute instruction. Nevertheless, there have not been wanting teachers, nor is there any present lack of them, who from some unaccountable prejudice against this main arm of their strength, or from some remarkable, and to us, we confess, hardly intelligible metaphysical articles of belief regarding the nature of oral language, have raised their voices loudly in disparagement of this beautiful dialect of nature, and even, on paper, excluded it wholly, or nearly so, from their schools. That which we do not pretend to understand, we shall not attempt to explain; and we confess that we do not fully appreciate the reasoning, if it contain any soundness, which would claim for the human voice an exclusive fitness to constitute the medium of communication between moral and intellectual

beings. We have never seen reason to believe, that moral notions, or abstract ideas of any kind, cannot exist without the presence of oral representatives: but, so long as we have had an opportunity of observation, we have constantly seen facts to the contrary. Whatever may be the pre-conceived theoretic notions of any man, he ought, surely, to yield them to the evidence of his senses: and we know not how an individual could ever have been practically engaged in the instruction of the deaf and dumb, without having had the same reason to believe, that they think clearly upon subjects purely intellectual, which exists in the case of any other class of persons.

Under the influence of the belief, however, to which we have just alluded, most of the early instructors of the deaf and dumb, conceived their undertaking a hopeless one, unless they could succeed in bringing their pupils to the use of speech, like their fellow-men. They appear to have overlooked or disregarded the fact, that speech to the profoundly deaf cannot be a conscious enunciation of sounds; or that its elements cannot be in presence of the mind what words are to us. We think of words as audible, and are scarcely conscious of the play of the vocal organs. But the deaf and dumb, if taught to articulate, conceive words through the sense of touch; so that, after all, articulation is to them but another species of action, performed by the tongue and the lips instead of the hands.

The consequence, nevertheless, of this belief, which, by the way, we may remark, is still prevalent in Germany, was, that the attention of its subjects was fastened chiefly upon the means of teaching articulation. Much labor was thus expended upon a business wholly mechanical. It is by no means surprising, that those engaged in it should have been comparatively inattentive to the study of method in the subject-matter of instruction.

But it was not in perfecting modes of teaching articulation only, though chiefly, that the early instructors exercised their invention. The other instruments of communication occupied the attention of here and there an individual. Pereiré, a Portuguese, in Paris, devised a mode of syllabic spelling on the fingers, by means of which he was enabled to exhibit words with great rapidity. Like others he concealed his method, and it was lost. Vanin, as already mentioned, elaborated a method, of which the art of design was the basis. Kerger and De l'Épée gave their attention to the language of action, but neither of them to the neglect of articulation, and the art of

reading on the lips; which latter art must, of course, be taught, in order to render articulation of any value.

In later times, there has been no change of opinion in regard to the absolute importance of rendering the means of communication as perfect as possible; but in point of relative importance this labor has lost the prominent place it once occupied in the consideration of instructors. Moreover, the *comparative* usefulness of the several *instruments* of communication themselves, is better understood. It is pretty generally admitted, that articulation is not absolutely necessary to the operations of the mind. Dactylology and design are esteemed to have their proper spheres of usefulness; but, after all, the only essentials to a system of instruction for deaf-mutes, are considered to be the language of action and common alphabetic writing. The *processes* of instruction, by which we understand the intellectual exercises employed in advancing the pupil from step to step of his progress, are at present a subject of philosophic investigation: and *methods*,—by which word we intend the programme of the steps themselves,—are mapped out from a careful analysis of the great subject of language and a logical arrangement of its component parts.

That the teachers of later times have not been disposed to undervalue the instruments of communication, is manifest from a variety of evidences. Stenography, syllabic dactylology, design, and mimography,—which name is assigned to the art of representing or writing signs of action by means of elementary symbols,—have all formed the subjects of special labors and special publications: while at the same time, the oral and labial alphabets have still constituted, with a large class of instructors, the principal subject of thought.

It is much to be regretted, however, that, after all, we have at present no system, either of stenography, of syllabic spelling, or of mimography, in general use; nor any methodical series of designs extending beyond the simplest rudiments of nomenclature. M. Recoing, an able French teacher, a few years since, proposed a method of stenography for the deaf and dumb, adapted to the language of his own country, and resting, like the common systems, on pronunciation. To this he joined a system of syllabic dactylology, characterized of course by the same peculiarity. He undertook to justify his method by saying, that he considered instruction in articulation as an essential to the complete education of a deaf-mute; and that, for such a one, a method of stenographic or dactylological syllabi-

cation, must be founded on sound. But we need a system for use among those who are not articulators, and there is, at present, none such in existence.

One important advantage to be derived from the employment of a mode of finger-spelling by syllables, would be felt in the great amount of time which it would save. But this is by no means the only one. In consequence of the great reduction in the number of elementary signs composing each word, the word itself would be much less liable to be misapprehended or lost, than is the case when, as at present, eight or ten distinct positions of the fingers are all exhibited in rapid succession, as parts of the same whole. All that have had anything to do with the manual alphabet, are aware how difficult it often is, even for an adept, to follow the rapid spelling of the deaf and dumb. The two-handed alphabet of England is less liable to this objection, than the French single-handed alphabet employed in our institutions; both because so great rapidity is hardly practicable with two hands, and because the letters cannot run into each other, as in the use of ours. But the two-handed alphabet can only be used in a convenient attitude, and by giving one's self wholly to the business: whereas, that which exacts the use of but one hand, is available in almost every situation. Syllabic dactylology, by rendering the use of words much more easy, would, moreover, cause them more constantly to be used by the deaf-mute, to the exclusion of the signs of action. He would thus be placed more uninterruptedly in a school of language, of which the lessons, because they are practical, are likely to sink far more deeply into his mind than those of his teacher—the great school of usage.

In regard to *mimography*, very little has been done. M. Bébien, of Paris, is the author of a system of which the elements are characters employed to represent the members of the body and the features of the countenance, and also the varieties of motion and of physiognomical expression. M. Piroux, of Nancy, France, employs a system which he denominates *Tachymimography*, which makes no pretension to completeness, but is limited to the representation by lines, of the prominent characteristics of signs. A system preferable to either might probably be devised, by means of an analysis of gestures, as we find them, into their elements, and a representation of those elements by suitable simple characters.

Many attempts have been made to arrange for the purposes of deaf-mute instruction, a series of designs, illustrating not merely the names of things, or nouns, but all parts of speech,

and also phrases, sentences, and continued narrative. The value of this instrument cannot be over-estimated. It is much greater than it is yet generally understood to be : nevertheless, its rank is subordinate after all. If it is made the chief reliance in instruction, it will lead the pupil to confound the material with the immaterial unceasingly. There is, however, no danger of the excessive use of design, so long as even the simplest advantages which it offers are, for the most part, neglected, or of necessity foregone, from the want of designs themselves.

Beside the secondary instruments of instruction we have just been considering, a method of symbolification has also been usefully employed in illustrating the principles of grammar.

But labor expended upon the mechanical means of communication, have, in later times, been estimated at their true comparative value ; and the great mass of effort has been directed toward that branch of the art, which may more strictly be denominated intellectual. That the subject of method in the teaching of language is one of some intricacy, may be inferred from the widely-differing views of different men. Sicard, in a little work entitled "*Signes des mots, considérés sous le rapport de la Syntaxe*," commences thus : "The deaf-mute, having no need of instruction concerning words, except so far as he has ideas to express, and consequently propositions to form, and phrases to construct ; it must be only after having become acquainted with the *individual* value of words, that he should learn their *relative* value." A judicious friend, whose copy of this work has fallen into our hands, presents, in the margin, this sentence transformed as follows : "The deaf-mute having thoughts to express, and, by consequence, propositions to form, before knowing the individual value of the greater number of words ; he should learn the *relative* value of the first words he acquires, before proceeding to the *individual* value of others." The view of the subject taken by a large majority of modern instructors, who, for the most part, differ from Sicard, is here expressed. The consequences of the principle laid down by that eminent instructor, are, for good or for evil, seriously important. Carried out, as he carried it out in his practice, it would impose upon the learner an entire year's labor, expended in the study of a dry vocabulary, unvaried by the introduction of a single connected sentence. Moreover, the individual value of many words cannot be taught apart from their connection. Without this, all words become nouns alike, in the view of the learner. Very many have in combination a joint meaning, which, however it may be accounted for, from

a knowledge of their individual signification, is by no means of necessity inferable from the same, and can therefore only be taught when the combination is presented. Finally, all the connectives of the language can be properly taught only by exhibiting their office.

But though the general practice of modern times is at variance with that followed by Sicard, there are still great differences existing between the methods of different schools. These differences begin to manifest themselves in the very outset. Some teach a considerable vocabulary of nouns, adjectives, and verbs, before introducing connected propositions. Others introduce such propositions without delay. Some, before introducing the verb as an assertive, present it, for a certain length of time, under the imperative form. The substantive verb with some, again, takes precedence of all others; and with the help of this alone, they construct propositions out of nouns and adjectives. To others, this course seems highly injudicious; and they accordingly defer the substantive verb variously. Intransitive verbs are first presented by some; by others they are made to follow the transitive; while others still conform in this respect to no fixed rule, and often teach words of both classes indifferently together. Some from the very beginning connect articles with nouns; others defer the articles to a later period. The order and manner of introducing the personal and relative pronouns, the different modes and tenses of verbs, and the conjunctions, exhibit the greatest diversity in different schools. In short, there is no end to the differences of practice existing between different instructors; while all unite in holding to the general doctrine, that the instruction of the deaf and dumb should be assimilated, as far as possible, to the manner in which speaking children acquire their knowledge of language.

The extent to which our rambling remarks have already run, admonishes us to cut short the few observations which we proposed to make on this subject of method. Enough has already been said to illustrate the general proposition, that there yet remains much to be done, in order to establish uniformity of practice. And as for the most part, each instructor is ready to assign reasons for his methods particularly sound in his own eyes, and as, moreover, so surely as that truth is one, all methods cannot be equally good, it is still reserved for the ingenuity of philosophers to point out the best, if it exist, or, if not, to invent one which shall be such.

In what we have thus far said concerning methods, we have had our eye solely upon grammatical difficulties—chiefly the difficulties of construction. But no one, who for a moment considers the vast number of words which make up the language of speech, the diverse significations attached to each, and the endless variety of common metaphoric expressions in the mouths of all men at every moment, will hesitate to say, that he who should attempt to teach all these, would require the aid of the most rigid method. He who without such aid, enters with his pupil upon the broad field of language, is like a man wandering through a wilderness, with the intent to point out to another, individually, every tree and every sapling, every flower and every blade of grass embraced within its limits.

We have, then, ideas, words, and the laws of construction, to constitute the subject of our methods. This expresses the whole; but it leaves out of view some of the particular sources of difficulty in the teaching of language. In the manner of association of ideas with words, or in the capricious exactions of those laws of usage which are superior to and independent of the rules of syntax, will be found the matter of much study, and much labor in the task of instruction. We can only make ourselves intelligible by illustration.—The same fundamental idea is often, for example, associated with two words, both verbs, but one transitive and the other intransitive. Man *desires*, and he *wishes for* a thing; he *governs*, and he *rules over* a people; he *addresses*, and he *speaks to* a person; he *reaches*, and he *arrives at*, or he *leaves*, and he *departs from* a place. The consequence of this is, that the deaf-mute pupil will, in such cases, be continually inserting the preposition where it should be omitted, and omitting it where it should be inserted. Those who allow themselves to be surprised at this, because they never err in like manner, would do well to consider how tenacious their memories might prove, were they to be exercised upon the words of the Cherokee tongue; or better still, upon the signs of the Chinese, which address themselves only to the eye.

Again: every intransitive verb has certain prepositions with which it will combine, while it is never found connected with others. Each of these prepositions, also, usually modifies, in some manner, the sense of the verb itself, while its own radical signification is in like manner modified by the connection. Thus: to stand, to stand up, to stand for, (an office,) to stand up for, (a friend,) to stand on, (one's rights,) to stand to, (an assertion,) to stand into, (a port,) to stand out, (to resist,) &c.;

to call, to call to, to call for, (a person, or a dinner,) to call at, to call on, (a friend, or a debtor for payment,) to call out, (an antagonist,) to call up, (a document,) to call down, (a curse,) &c. ; to pay, to pay up, to pay down, to pay over, to pay out, to pay to, to pay attention to, to pay a compliment to, to pay regard to, to pay for, &c. ; to look, to look at, to look to, to look up to, to look into, to look for, to look over, to look after, to look down, to look down on, &c. ; to draw, to draw up, (a writing,) to draw down, (a misfortune,) to draw out, (a plan,) to draw on, (a banker, or a boot,) to draw from, (obtain information,) &c. ; to run, to run over, (examine,) to run up, (a bill,) to run down, (vulgarism—to decry,) to run into, (debt,) to run out, (a line, also, to become exhausted,) to run with or against, (an opponent,) to run for, (a prize.) Very various meanings are here attached to the same words differently combined. The ideas are, therefore, associated with the combination of words, and not with the individual words themselves. If it is replied, that every variety of signification is deducible figuratively from the simple original sense of each separate word, we may rejoin, that though analogy may thus very well account to us for the facts as we find them, still we can by no *a priori* process, advance in any particular instance from the simple meaning of a word, to that numerous progeny of secondary significations, of which usage has decreed it to be the representative. The secondary meanings are not by any means the necessary consequences of the primary ; for the analogies out of which they spring are not always the most direct, nor are the families, which, in different languages, cluster about the same radical, similarly composed. These compound words, therefore, serve by so much to swell the vocabulary we have to teach to the deaf and dumb ; and their differences of meaning are, moreover, less easy to be retained than those of simple words, from the fact, that their elements have themselves a significancy different from that of the combination.

Again : there are words which, without change of form, fulfill the offices of various parts of speech. To eye, to hand, to finger, to thumb, to shoulder, to breast, to toe, to rake, to saw, to hammer, to plough, to pen, &c. ; these are examples of words employed both as nouns and as verbs. So numerous are the instances of this kind, that, by induction, the deaf-mute is led to employ many words in a connection which usage will not permit. If we may say to elbow, why not also to knee ? if to nose, why not to chin ? if to eye, why not to

ear? Nor are the terminations usually distinctive of particular parts of speech always to be relied on as a guide. To father, to master, to butcher, to doctor, to tutor, to petition, to sanction, to motion, to portion, to proportion, to license, to silence, to sentence, &c., are nouns with characteristic terminations, used also as verbs. The words, representative, motive, appellative, affirmative, negative, derivative, preservative, preventive, captive, soporific, cathartic, mechanic, domestic, incendiary, accessory, preliminary, stipendiary, summary, material, ceremonial, official, essential, &c., are adjectives, with adjective terminations, used also as nouns. Some words have a three-fold, and some even a four-fold grammatical character. Light, is at once a noun, an adjective, and a verb; right, is a noun, an adjective, a verb, and an adverb. It is an adverb in such a connection as the following: "I only speak *right on*." It is obvious, then, that for the deaf and dumb we have a species of negative as well as of positive instruction to give: we must teach them the uses of words which are not allowable, as well as those which are. These things are learned by those who hear without effort. Every day, and every hour, brings its lesson, in their ordinary intercourse with the surrounding world. But, to the deaf and dumb, shut out from this most valuable of schools, each of these facts, which thus imperceptibly adds itself to the intellectual stores of others, must be an object of direct and conscious observation; and the teacher must be constantly on the watch to prevent them from confounding fixed principles and universal laws, with the mere irregular caprices of usage.

Derivation is another subject which requires special attention in the instruction of the deaf and dumb. Primitives, analogous, whether in form or in signification, form their derivatives variously. Thus we have, to lighten and to tighten, but not to righten, or to blighten; to heighten, to lengthen, and to thicken, but not to breadthen, to widen, or to deepen. From the verbs conceive and deceive, we have the nouns conceit and conception, deceit and deception; from the verb receive, the nouns receipt and reception; and from the verb perceive, the noun perception only. From treat and entreat, we have treaty and entreaty; but retreat and defeat are nouns without change of form. From the noun harmony, we have the verb harmonize; from colony, colonize; from agony, agonize; from scrutiny, scrutinize; but we do not make symphonize, or felonize, mutinize, or destinize, from the corresponding nouns. From the adjectives familiar and particu-

lar, we have the verbs familiarize and particularize ; but from similar and regular, similarize and regularize are not formed. From fly, we have flight ; from comply, compliance ; from apply, application ; from deny, denial ; from reply and supply, nouns of the same form. From moderate, we have moderation ; from temperate, temperance ; from obstinate, obstinacy ; from precipitate, precipitancy and precipitation ; from accurate, accurateness and accuracy.

But the irregularities of derivation are too familiar to every one to need illustration. The difficulty which they throw in the way of the deaf-mute, will be easily understood from what has been already said. And this difficulty in his case, is increased by the fact, that euphony often determines the form of a derivative : and this, of course, can never be a guide to him.

Another difficulty arises from the fact, that many objects and actions which, in themselves, are radically the same, are differently named, according to circumstances. Thus : we eat food and drink water, but we neither eat nor drink medicine—we *take* it. A vessel is piloted into a harbor, a traveler is guided through a forest. A canal is excavated, a ditch is dug, and a well is sunk. A ship is constructed, and a building is erected. A clergyman preaches, a lawyer pleads, a professor lectures, and an orator harangues. A soldier receives pay, a clerk a salary, and a laborer wages.

There are words, also, which, in certain connections, may be interchanged, but in certain others have uses individually peculiar. We say indifferently, to pull a tooth, to extract a tooth, and to draw a tooth ; but we cannot speak of pulling or drawing a passage from a book, though we may extract it, and may draw an idea from it, after it is extracted. We may either read or peruse a newspaper, but we cannot peruse villainy in a man's countenance, though we may read it there. We may, nevertheless, peruse his countenance, and read it likewise, but when we cast our eyes over a prospect, we peruse rather than read the scene spread out before us. We may either suspend or hang a bucket in a well, but, though we may suspend our projects, we cannot hang them. So a bank suspends payment, and a gun hangs fire. The distinctions are sometimes very nice : "Hang out our banners on the outward walls." It would hardly do to say, "suspend" them.

When, in cases like the foregoing, two or more words admit of being interchanged in some circumstances, but not in all, it is commonly because in their simple, original sense, they

are nearly synonymous, while usage has not allowed their figurative meanings to continue parallel ; or because, being radically dissimilar, their figurative meanings occasionally correspond. This leads us to remark farther, that all those figures of words, called by rhetoricians *tropes*, are sources of perplexity to the deaf and dumb. Patrick Henry says : "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided." A deaf-mute is slow to understand why it is not as well to say a candle ; particularly when no objection is found to lie against a torch. Examples of this kind are of constant occurrence. An oak is styled a monarch of the forest, and the sun, the king of day ; but it will not do to interchange these terms. Every man has his particular sphere of action ; it is absurd to say his globe. We are pleased with the face of the country, but not with its countenance ; we study the features of a landscape, but not its traits.

These are a few of the difficulties to be encountered by the deaf and dumb in the study of language. Having already exceeded the limits assigned us, we are forced to close the enumeration here. Our object, in the detailed exhibition we have made, is not to point out anything new in the structure of language, or in the materials of which it is composed, for all these facts are familiar to every one ; but to show how much that others acquire insensibly, can only, to this class of learners, be an attainment of direct and laborious study—a treasure accumulated in the memory by an infinite series of positive efforts. Our wonder, therefore, should not be to find, for a long time, expressions in their compositions, which do violence to the requisitions of established usage ; but rather ever to meet with any instance in which these peculiarities entirely disappear.

Nothing need be added to what has already been said, to show the immense importance of a judicious arrangement for the purposes of instruction, of the details of a subject so extensive, and embracing so great a variety of minutiae to be separately considered. Indeed, without this it is idle to think of imparting to deaf-mutes even a respectable knowledge of the language of their country. Too many, it is to be feared, at the present time, leave our institutions but half educated ; and the instances are rare, indeed, in which the grand object at which our theory aims—to make alphabetic language for the deaf and dumb the instrument of thought as well as of communication—is attained.

Our institutions are not yet quite perfect. In the first place,

they have still too little of method ; and in the second, they aim to effect too much with too feeble means. For one instructor to impart to a class of twenty deaf-mutes a thorough knowledge of the English language, in a space of five years, is a thing impossible—a thing that never has been done, and a thing that never will be done ; for much instruction must be individual, and the attention of the teacher cannot be occupied with a single pupil, except to the neglect, for the time, of all the rest. If here and there one attains to superior excellence, it is only because heaven has blessed him with superior abilities, and because he has trained himself to habits of superior application.

Since the lamentable failure of all the efforts of medical science, to remove an infirmity so serious in its consequences, there remains but one channel through which philanthropy can exert itself to meliorate the condition of the unfortunate deaf-mute. How important, then, by every possible means, to perfect the art of his instruction, and to render institutions, in fact, all that they are in profession ! It is gratifying to observe, and the circular before us is a part of the evidence, that the tendency to improvement is more decided at this moment than ever before. There is a spirit abroad, that will never rest contented while any imperfection remains. And though, in contemplating the history of the past or the present results of our own immediate efforts, we are obliged to admit our feelings to be in some measure those of disappointment, we find, nevertheless, even in these things, no reason to be discouraged ; while, on the other hand, in the fair promise of the future, in the zeal and talent enlisted in this cause throughout Europe, in the universal tendency to concentration of effort, in the gradual abandonment of false philosophies, and in the growing prevalence of just and enlightened views, we behold a sure guarantee of the ultimate realization of all our hopes.

ART. II.—ON DISSENSIONS AMONG CHRISTIAN BRETHREN.

[The following article was, in substance, delivered as the *Concio ad Clerum*, at the late Commencement in Yale College. The text upon which it was founded was Ephesians iv. 3: "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." It is now published by request, with some modifications to adapt it to the pages of this work.]

THE cultivation of fraternal affection and mutual confidence among the followers of Christ, is often and strongly inculcated in the scriptures. It was one of the leading themes on which the Savior himself insisted, in his last discourse and prayer with his disciples, before he left the world. The ground upon which this duty is urged is, "that there is one body and one spirit, even as christians are called in one hope of their calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of them all." There is no *such* ground of union among any body of men on earth, as that which subsists among christians. Think what it is to have one God as the Father of them all, whose unchanging purpose of grace in Christ, existing from before the foundation of the world, has called them to be saints. Think what it is to have one and the same Almighty Redeemer, through the shedding of whose blood pardon and peace with God have been conferred upon them. Think what it is to have become subjects of the converting and purifying influence of one and the same divine Sanctifier. Think what it is to have been led to embrace the one great and peculiar system of truth contained in the gospel. Think what it is, in fine, to have one and the same hope of their calling, a hope looking forward to such a reversion in the world to come. Now is there any *such* ground of union, any such foundation for *fraternal* affection and confidence among other men, as there is among christians? What a blessed unity is the "unity of the Spirit!" and how sacredly ought it to be cherished and kept "in the bond of peace!"

But it would be a mere affectation of charity, or of ignorance respecting the passing events of the day, if, on the present occasion, and before this audience, we should attempt to disguise or palliate the fact, that the unity of the Spirit among the followers of Christ has not been kept, as it should have been, in the bond of peace; that dissensions among brethren have of late arisen, and are now prevailing to an unusual extent; that they are dividing the ministry, and rending the church of God in this land, and crucifying the Savior

of the world afresh, and putting him to open shame. The design, then, of the following remarks, will not, it is believed, be thought improper or unseasonable. That design will be, to state with plainness and fidelity, what are conceived to be some of the leading *causes* of disunion among brethren at the present day; contemplate some of the *evils* to which such disunion is giving rise; and point out some things to be done by way of *remedy* for these evils.

First. Shall we be allowed to name, with plainness and fidelity, some of the *causes* of disunion among brethren, which, it is apprehended, exist and operate at the present day? The love of *power* and the desire of *pre-eminence* are not unfrequently, perhaps they are now, causes of disunion among brethren. The love of power is a principle of our nature which belongs, more or less, to all men. In some minds it is peculiarly strong, and constitutes one of the master-principles by which they are governed. It is impossible to look at the conduct of some men, with any degree of care and attention, without perceiving, that in all their leading plans and pursuits in life, it is one favorite object with them to control and direct the minds of other men. They wish to be leaders in every important enterprise. They are jealous of the influence of others. And when occasion for it offers, they are always engaged in forming parties, that they may exercise power over them, and enjoy the satisfaction of seeing them enter into their plans, and yield themselves to their dictation and control. Are these men already *in* power, and at the same time advanced in life? they naturally wish to fortify themselves in the possession of that power. They cannot bear to give it up, and see it pass away into other hands. "Aut Cesar aut nullus," is a feeling the strength of which is not diminished by progress in years, or by the customary influence of habit over the human mind. Are they less advanced in life, or just entering upon some public career of distinction? the lust of power, in whomsoever it exists, is one of the strongest impulses that the mind of man ever feels, to urge them on in the prosecution of their object. Nor are men who are governed by this principle, apt to be very fastidious as to the means which they make use of for the attainment of their object. The end is too often made to justify the means. The nature of the *emergency*, it is thought, is such as to make the case in hand an exception to the operation of the customary rules of propriety in other cases. Or, the auspicious *moment* must be seized for accomplishing their object; and to do this, a

departure from the tardier forms of procedure held obligatory under ordinary circumstances, is resorted to, and justified, upon the plea of necessity. The truth is, that the love of power, in whomsoever it exists as a governing principle, is exceedingly dangerous. What havoc has it made in the church of Christ in almost every age! How unlike is it to the spirit of the Author of christianity! How foreign from the humble, unaspiring temper which he inculcated upon his disciples! No wonder, that, when this unholy lust of power creeps in among christians, disagreement and strife should ensue.

The desire of *pre-eminence* is another form of the same principle, and leads to the same results. Like the simple love of power, it is in some minds peculiarly strong, and requires to be watched and guarded against with peculiar vigilance. Nor is the good man wholly free from it. Among the primitive disciples of our Lord, there was once a dispute which of them should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. The desire of pre-eminence had crept in even among them. The pointed admonition which they received on that occasion, may have some application beyond the immediate occasion which called it forth. "And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said: Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself *as this little child*, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Hear him, also, on another occasion: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many." Now only let the humble, unaspiring spirit here inculcated, reign among the professed followers of Christ, and what a happy church, what a happy world, would it produce!

Undue reliance upon *human creeds and formularies in religion*, for the protection of orthodoxy and order in the church, is another fruitful source of divisions and strifes among brethren. That religious creeds and forms of church-order may, for some purposes, be useful; that, under proper restrictions, they may be even necessary to the stability and purity of the church, is not denied, but is cheerfully admitted.

But in order to this, they should be very brief and extremely simple. For as they must be at best but *human* compositions, the more extended and ramified into particulars they become, beyond a few plain points, the more liable are they to depart from the simplicity of the bible, and the more room is given for a difference of construction to be put upon them, when under different circumstances among men, they come to be examined and reduced to practice. In point of fact, it will generally be found true, that where reliance is chiefly had upon human symbols of faith and rules of church-order, not obviously and undeniably deducible from the written word of God, and where truth and piety are expected to be kept in the church in this way, while error and irreligion are thus expected to be kept out of it, such expectations have rarely been realized. There is a reliance upon forms and creeds, which is absolutely fatal to the vitality and power of religion. It brings on a cold, heartless, dead indifference to everything in religion but the mere frame-work of christianity. And when once the vital spirit is gone; when the "weightier matters of the law, justice, truth, and mercy," are neglected, for the sake of attending exclusively to "the mint, and anise, and cummin;" when good men cease to labor to win souls to Christ, and to build up his kingdom, which is not "meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" then, in such circumstances, how easy does it become for the bond of peace among brethren to be broken, and for a fiery zeal about orthodoxy, or about dead forms of some kind or other, to rend the church asunder, and to send strife and confusion through the disjointed and bleeding body of Christ! There must be a looking, far higher than to any human forms and creeds, however excellent they may be, for safety and peace to the church, if safety and peace to the church are ever found. Dead formularies in religion will never prove an adequate safeguard against the inroads of error and corruption. And yet they may be *relied* upon for this purpose, far beyond their legitimate value. Whether this is not done at the present day, in certain portions of the church, demands, we think, serious consideration.

Departing from plain acknowledged *common sense principles in the interpretation of the word of God*, has in every age opened a wide door to the introduction of disunion into the church. This is not denying, that the theology of the bible, any more than the science of nature around us, has its mysteries, which no human mind can unravel. This is not

saying, that human intuition or human reasoning is sufficient to discover and lay open the *mode* of existence of a great many things, which are nevertheless indubitable facts in the government and works of God. He must know little of himself, and little of the universe in which he dwells, and little of his bible too, who expects to comprehend fully the various subjects of his faith, if he believes anything beyond the immediate circle of his senses. But while all this is true, it is also true, that mysteries are not contradictions nor absurdities. The human mind is so formed, that certain principles and facts in morals and religion, do and must commend themselves to it as right and true, and certain other assumed principles and facts as false and wrong. The only way in which the former can ever come to be doubted and disbelieved, and the latter received as right and true by the mind, is through the blinding influence of prejudice and passion and party feeling in relation to them. Especially is this true under the clear light of the gospel, and with the privilege of prayer for divine guidance accorded to us and made use of by us. The bible, as to every great practical purpose which it was designed to answer, is the plainest and most intelligible book in the world. It proceeds, in all its disclosures of men's duties, upon the most obvious common sense principles, such as every unprejudiced mind does and must acknowledge. Written for all men, it appeals of course to the common principles and feelings of our nature. And it requires, in the actual interpretation of it, only those rules of construction which we readily apply in the reading of any other and uninspired book, with the single exception of a higher reverence for it, arising out of its claim to be a communication from God. Yet what book on earth has ever been so strangely interpreted, as has the bible? In ascertaining the meaning, of what other and uninspired production have men resorted to such extraordinary principles, not merely of criticism, but of reason and morality too, as those to which some men have resorted in understanding the moral lessons of the word of God? In how many instances have the common dictates of the human understanding been utterly disregarded and trampled on, as of no worth, in expounding the great truths of divine revelation? Now when men, for the sake of making out or defending a favorite system, or through the influence of a love of power or pre-eminence, or any such cause, are found willing to renounce the guidance of plain common sense, a guidance so much and so justly valued in all other matters of any practical consequence

to mankind ; and when they call upon others to go along with them in *their* method of expounding the scriptures, to reason as they reason, and believe as they believe, and feel as they feel on these subjects ; is it any wonder, that disagreement and strife should, sooner or later, be engendered among brethren, as the consequence ? Much as this is to be deplored, can it be reasonably wondered at ? Is it not a legitimate effect of the cause which gives rise to it ? If it would not be regarded as invidious or unkind, the following illustrations of the particular topic now before us might be given.—The principle is sometimes assumed, and attempted to be established by scripture, that the posterity of Adam are guilty, and justly punishable with eternal death, on account of *his* first transgression ; on the ground that *his* sin in the garden of Eden was in fact *their* sin, by reason of a certain assumed inexplicable identity between him and them ; they and he constituting one and the same complex moral being, like the root and branches of a tree. Thousands of years may have intervened between him and them, and yet in *his* fall *they* sinned. Not merely that there was a connection, an infallible connection, between his sinning and their sinning ; this we admit : but that in *his* first transgression and fall *they* also transgressed and fell, as part and parcel with him in that transaction. What human mind, not prejudiced by attachment to some favorite system, or not blinded by some other cause, can receive such a proposition as this for divine truth ? Or, again, sin may exist, and in part does exist in mankind irrespective of intelligent moral action ; in other language, guilt, and exposure to punishment for it, may and do attach to persons concerning whom no accountable action of any kind is supposed to be predicable. What must such sin and guilt and punishment be, according to all our natural notions of right and wrong in any other case ? Or, again, men in their fallen state may be and are under obligation to obey God, without a real *ability* of any kind to do so ; and ability of any kind, in fallen men, to obey God, is not necessary to constitute moral obligation. Since the fall, men cannot in any sense repent of their sins without the aid of divine grace, and yet it is their duty to repent, and they are justly punishable, and will in fact be punished, for not repenting. What sort of obligation can that be, which pre-supposes no real ability of any kind, in the subject of it, to do the thing required of him ? Or, once more, God now *commands* all men everywhere to repent ; and yet, at the same time, he chooses and prefers, in view of all things, actual

and possible, (and therefore in view of this very command,) that by far the larger part of those who now have the command, should not repent, but should disobey him in this very instance of his rightful authority over them. Propositions like the foregoing, attempted to be supported by scripture, and brought forward as the doctrines of scripture, cannot fail, sooner or later, to lead to some disagreement in opinion respecting them. All minds cannot receive them as true. The reason of this is, they contradict what, in the view of those minds, are some of the plainest and most unquestionable dictates of common sense. Now any attempts to make these and similar propositions the standards and tests of religious orthodoxy, or any attempts to coerce men into the belief of them, by means of ecclesiastical censures held out *in terrorem* over them, can only be productive, while the intellect of man remains what it is, of disunion and strife. In closing these illustrations, it is due to our feelings to say, that they have been brought forward as illustrations merely, and not from any pleasure we feel in stating what we conceive to be the errors of some good brethren who differ from us. The simple object of the introduction of these illustrations here, is to show, that when common sense is departed from in our expositions of scripture truth, a wide door is opened for many evils to come in, the church will be in danger of being divided and agitated, and the waters of strife will only continue to rise and roar around her.

Neglect to cultivate the *spirit* of the bible, is another source of dissension in the church. There is pervading and running through the scriptures, what may be called the *spirit* of that blessed book. There is not only a set of doctrinal truths running through the inspired oracles, and imparting to them a distinctive character wholly peculiar to themselves; but there is also a moral temper of spirit, equally characterizing the sacred pages, and equally fitted to arrest attention, and strongly tending to breathe itself into the reader's soul. So pure, so gentle, so lovely is it, that no man who truly imbibes this spirit, and habitually feels its influence upon him, can so understand and receive the *doctrinal* truths of the bible, as to be very much of a partisan in the manner and feelings with which he maintains them. He will feel too much of the docility of a "little child;" will be as his Divine Master was, too "meek and lowly in heart" to allow him to go everywhere in fomenting animosities and divisions among brethren, even in contending for the truth. It will be far more pleasant to him to notice

how broad is the ground in which they are agreed, than to dwell on the few points about which they differ. Now one cause of dissension among christians at the present day, is a disproportionate attention to doctrinal knowledge, and an undue neglect to cultivate the spirit of the bible. There has been too much speculation, discussion, and investigation, for the relative amount of spirituality of feeling which has been cherished along with it. And when the spirit of the gospel is neglected, and the chief efforts of men's minds are directed to elaborate and formal expositions or defenses of doctrinal truth, there is much danger, that in such a state of mind some points will be pressed too far, or dwelt upon too much, whilst other points will be comparatively lost sight of, and thus that a partial, one-sided view of christianity, will be presented, and not the whole harmonious gospel of Christ. Or, at least, it will be only an external form and skeleton of christianity, without the animating spirit within to give it the freshness and beauty of real life. Such, we think, has been of late, and is now, the state of things in our beloved Zion. We have had, amidst all our professed tremblings for the ark of God in some other respects, too little anxiety about maintaining the vital spirit of religion. To maintain an exact and rigorous orthodoxy, to keep out from the church irregularity and *quasi* heresy, (or something which it was feared might lead on to heresy,) has been so much the order of the day, that many have suffered the fire of holy love to die away at their hearts; and direct efforts to save souls from the second death, have been too much omitted; and coldness, and distance, and suspicion, have thus sprung up between the disciples of our common Lord, and the adherents of the same precious faith. It must never be forgotten, in our zeal to defend divine truths, that the *spirit* of the gospel should be as assiduously cultivated as the simple science of theology or ethics. Both of them should go together; and there will ever be danger when the former is neglected, however much attention, in the mean time, may be given to the latter.

The true principle of *christian liberty* has, also, been practically too much overlooked. With Protestants, the bible is the only infallible authority in matters of religion. Every man has a right to read and interpret the bible for himself—the same right which every other man possesses. And if, in the honest endeavor thus to learn what is “the mind of the Spirit,” one man should slightly differ from another in the conclusions to which he comes respecting the question, What is the mind of the Spirit?

there ought to be no unkind feeling between them, but mutual love and forbearance, and (so far as the case will possibly admit) the extending to each other of the hand of christian fellowship. This is the true principle of liberty among the disciples of Christ. This is acting upon the great rule of righteousness laid down by our Savior, of doing to others as we would that they should do to us. But how often is this rule departed from in practice. How often is the bed of Procrustes introduced into the church, and an attempt made to fit men's religious opinions to it. If too long, they must be shortened; and if too short, they must be stretched out to the exact dimensions of the prescribed model. No wonder, that the cause of christianity bleeds under such a process of keeping things straight. How unlike to all this is the law of christian liberty and catholicism, laid down in the 14th of Romans: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? and why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Let us not, therefore, judge one another any more, but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way. Destroyest thou with thy meat him for whom Christ died?" The foregoing, if we do not misjudge, may be regarded as holding a prominent place among the *causes* of disunion among brethren at the present day.

Secondly. We will briefly notice some of the *evils* of such a state of things. On these we shall not dwell at much length. A cursory notice will be sufficient to point them out and cause them to be seen, and that is all we intend by referring to them at all. For obvious reasons, we choose rather to dwell upon the causes of these evils, than upon the evils themselves. Among these evils the following deserve a distinct specification.—Important doctrinal *truth* is in danger of being sacrificed, and *error* introduced and protected through these unholy collisions among brethren. Friendly discussion, conducted in the spirit of christian meekness and love, tends to elicit truth, and to detect and keep out error. But heated and angry controversy has just the opposite effect. Men, in such a state of mind, are in danger of losing sight of the great interests of truth and righteousness, and of contending for victory and for party applause, rather than for the great cause of truth and holiness on earth. When "the band of peace" is broken, and brotherly love is gone, the "unity of the spirit," in respect to *doctrine*, also usually goes with it; and various corruptions of the truth, as it is in Jesus, more or less fatal, are in this

way brought in upon the church, to weaken her strength, and to clog and hinder the progress of this world's salvation. *Trusts*, also, of different kinds, both public and private, and of the most sacred character, are, in the same way, in danger of being perverted from their legitimate meaning and design. For example: a man bequeathes his property, by last will and testament, in trust for certain specified religious uses. His object is to obey the command of heaven, who directs him to "honor God" with his worldly substance. But how can he be sure, under the state of things here contemplated, that his benevolent intentions will ever be fulfilled? How can he be sure, that any written instrument, drawn up with whatever legal precision it may be, and especially that instruments, drawn as they often are without any technical precision at all, will not be wrested from their true aim and design, and that the rights and interests which it was intended should vest under them, will not be utterly sacrificed at the shrine of party cupidity or ambition? Or, a man in the unsuspecting openness of christian friendship, expresses his views to another *by letter*, on subjects of great delicacy, and affecting, it may be, the private character and personal standing in the church of some other and third party besides themselves; how can he know, that by some means or other the seal of private friendship will not hereafter be broken, and even the ashes of the dead be disturbed, in order to disclose to the public eye what had passed, thus confidentially, between intimate friends, while they were living? And who would be willing to have his confidential communications with his friends, on subjects of great interest and great delicacy, brought out to the public gaze, after he is dead and gone, and made the subjects of such comments, and such a construction, as the spirit of angry controversy or of party zeal might see fit to put upon them? Or, men are called to occupy posts of public distinction and great responsibility, *in our literary and theological institutions*, and they have important public interests confided to their care, in virtue of the seats which they fill; how shall it be known and provided for, that under the reign of party strife in the church, these men will not themselves be drawn away into the conflict, and thus the interests confided to their hands be exposed to great hazard? In short, what certain or adequate protection from violation and abuse is there for almost any trust, public or private, in times of high and unholy party excitement. How fearfully, at such times, is the very foundation of mutual confidence among men shaken. The evils to the church and to the

world springing from this single source, we cannot but regard, at the present day, as something more than problematical, or as simply perspective and imminent. Personal *character*, also, and *motives*, are in danger, at such times, of being rudely and causelessly assailed. Let the spirit of dissension pervade any body of men; let it enter the happy world above; let it infect the minds of blessed angels; and the result would be, that personal character would not be safe even there. Heaven itself would become a scene of whisperings and backbitings, and angelic purity would be no protection against the foul breath of misrepresentation and obloquy. No matter how upright and irreproachable a man's life may be; no matter how devoted or abundant in labors for the good of his fellow-men he may be; there is nothing, in any degree of virtue attained by men on earth, which is inviolably sacred and secure against the influence of suspicion and evil surmisings, wherever the bond of peace among brethren is broken. Who of us would be safe from the danger of suspicion and complaint, in times of great agitation and excitement, when all around us were divided into parties, and when party rumor, vague, irresponsible, reckless, as party rumor usually is, but still dignified with the appellation of "common fame," might be received and accredited as a competent witness against us? Who of us, humble as our position in society may be, would be willing, in the circumstances supposed, to be arraigned before such a tribunal, and to hear his character and peace of mind subjected to a sentence swayed and determined by such an accuser?

The *public press*, moreover, in such a posture of things, is in danger of being perverted and corrupted. The public press, in this land, is wielding a tremendous power, for good or for evil. In the simple form of newspaper intelligence, it is sending out a mighty influence upon the mind, and heart, and conscience, of our reading population; and all our population, with slight exceptions, is a reading population. In the single department of morals and religion, the periodical publications in this country are numerous and constantly increasing, and they are holding a vast power over the public mind. By means of these journals, occurrences possessing any general interest among religious people, may, in a very few hours, be circulated extensively over the land. And thus a common impulse may be simultaneously produced, among thousands and millions of people, whenever anything takes place of sufficient importance to give rise to it. Now, let divisions arise among the friends of the

Redeemer; let public assemblies be convoked, and let the champions of the conflicting parties be called out in public debate, to set up their respective banners to the people; and how instantly, as the consequence, are the party-presses in operation, teeming and groaning with accounts of their speeches and doings, and each in its own peculiar style of laudatory amplification on the one hand, or of severe causticity and condemnation on the other! And how long will it be, under the influence of such a state of things as this, before our press, our *religious* press, in this nation, will become corrupted almost beyond the hope of recovery? But whenever the periodical press in this land shall become thus corrupted—which may Heaven avert from us—then what have we to look for, but the prophet's "roll of lamentation, and mourning, and wo," written without and within, and hung out over *our* beloved Zion?

Great plans of *christian benevolence* are in danger of being crippled and broken up in the same way. If there are any objects of common interest among christians, that require common efforts and common sacrifices, and joint counsels and prayers, to promote them, it is such objects as our great benevolent institutions of this age have in contemplation. But division and discord tend directly to cripple and destroy all the energies and resources of the church for accomplishing these objects. This is too plain to require any argument in proof of it. Let the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations in this country become extensively divided on this subject; let one portion of these denominations undertake the work of missions or the business of education in one way, and another portion of them in another way; and let this division be effected on the avowed ground, that the one way, resorted to by one portion of christians is right, and the other way, resorted to by another portion, is wrong, wrong in principle, radically wrong; and what but mutual clashing and jarring with each other can be the consequence? This, surely, is not the way to promote the strength and the success of any cause. It is the way to weaken, to cripple, and to destroy.

Finally: through dissensions among brethren, *the Spirit of God is grieved*, and leanness of soul is sent into the church. This is *now* but too manifestly the fact all around. And what shall be done? The influences of the Spirit, sent down upon our churches, our nation, and the world of mankind, constitute the sheet-anchor of our hopes. All our efforts to convert men to God, and to bring on the predicted period of universal

holiness and peace on earth, will be put forth to no purpose, if we have no ulterior reliance beyond what *man* can do in this work. We may as well stop where we are, and sit down in despair of our object, as to go on trying to convert the world to God without the special agency of the Holy Spirit. But how is this divine agency, this indispensable desideratum in our work, to be secured? One thing is certain, beyond all question: the Spirit's influence in our work is *not* to be secured by contention and strife.

"The Spirit, like a peaceful dove,
Flies from the realms of noise and war."

Already have we not occasion to mourn over the Spirit's blessed influences, as things that *once were* among us, and as objects of mournful remembrance? And what effect, brethren, have our strifes and contentions had to bring this state of things to pass? Is there no guilt upon us in this matter?

Thirdly. Some things to be done by way of *remedy* for the evils referred to.—Christian brethren must cultivate a sense of their *own* liability to err and to indulge a wrong spirit. *All* the danger on this subject does not lie on any one side: there is danger on every side, especially in times like the present, and under influences such as are now at work. Let this fact be often brought into view, and let it be kept in view. Let each one remember, that possibly *he* may be the individual who, in some respect or other, is pushing matters into extremes in regard to the doctrinal views for which he contends, or that he is contributing an influence in some other way, to call unholy passions into exercise. Let every man prove his *own* work, of what sort it is.

Again: let christian brethren cherish a spirit of mutual *forbearance* and *forgiveness* under injuries and provocations, real and supposed. If the charge is made against any one, of a departure from the faith once delivered to the saints, and the charge is felt not to be true, let it be met in the spirit of continued kindness and love. Let it be borne with unruffled meekness. Let calm and friendly discussion and explanation, not angry invective and returning evil for evil, be resorted to in self-defense. In this imperfect state, where we all have so much occasion for self-distrust and self-condemnation, who of us, in any case of disagreement, ought to be willing to cast the first stone? Who of us would not rather be like the meek and holy Savior, who, "when reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously?"

Again : let christians remember, that their brethren of all parties have the same *right of private judgment*, in matters of religion, which they themselves possess. God has given to every man this inalienable right to examine the scriptures, and to decide for himself what are the truths contained in them, and to believe accordingly. This right every man is bound, so far as circumstances will permit, to exercise. No other man or body of men may lawfully interfere with him in the enjoyment of this right. It is the very spirit of intolerance to call this right in question.

Let christian brethren also remember, that they all serve *one and the same Master* in heaven. Christ is not divided. Paul was not crucified for us. There is one faith, one Lord, one internal spiritual baptism by the Holy Ghost. This is the "*unity of the Spirit*" which subsists among all real christians. They have not, each one, a different Savior and a different Sanctifier : that would divide them of course. But they are "all of them the children of God *through faith in Christ Jesus.*" Why then should they not be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same spirit ? Or if little unavoidable discrepancies should arise between them, why should these be supposed to mar the *great* bond of peace among them, that they have one Master, even Christ ?

Further : let there be no unkind or irritating *correspondences by letter* carried on, but let each one be unostentatiously and noiselessly employed in endeavoring to build up the Redeemer's kingdom, in the sphere which God has assigned him. Let him throw himself, with all the ardor and energy he possesses, into the work of winning souls to Christ. In this work, how quickly do they who thus engage in it begin to love one another, and to feel a common sympathy and a common fellowship binding them sweetly together ! Men who are properly engaged in this employment, cannot very seriously disagree about anything. At least, if there is any employment on earth, that will make men love one another, it is the employment of honestly and devotedly endeavoring to save souls. Let the 13th chapter of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians be studied thoroughly, (as much so as the 5th of Romans,) and let it be expounded publicly in all the pulpits in the land. We want only the *spirit* which this chapter breathes, to heal every breach, and to send through the church on earth a thrill of joy, that should reach up to heaven and call down happy spirits there to rejoice over us. Let the friends of the Redeemer, also, set apart a season in which they will unite to

pray for each other and for the peace of Jerusalem. Why cannot time be found for this purpose at each return of the *Commencement anniversaries* in this Institution? Endeared as this institution is to so many hearts, by early and interesting associations of the strongest kind, why cannot brethren come together here, once a year, for united prayer over our common interests, and common pursuits, and common juvenile recollections, and common trials and responsibilities? Such an exercise would be in itself an auspicious omen for the cause of truth and holiness in this beloved seat of science and learning.

Finally: let existing differences in opinion or feeling among brethren be carried up, by anticipation, to the *infallible tribunal* of truth and righteousness, before which we must all so soon appear to render an account of our work on earth; and let them be fairly and fully tested in the light which the bare anticipation of the decisions of that tribunal might cast upon them. Possibly some points of disagreement here, which may be magnified into matters of importance now, will then, in the day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, become very small, unessential matters. Possibly some portion of what is deemed christian orthodoxy now, or constructive heresy now, will appear far differently then. And to look forward now and anticipate beforehand that great trial of men's characters, may have some effect, perhaps, to make great things appear great, and small things to appear small, and thus may tend to lead us all more intelligently and more earnestly to endeavor to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One thing is certain, that to fear God and keep his commandments will then be found, when that great day shall arrive, to have been of supreme importance to every man.

To the view of this subject as now presented, a few brief practical deductions will be appended. First. *Separation* among brethren is not the proper cure for disunion: agreeing to disagree is not keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The only way to remedy the evil of dissension is to love one another with a pure heart fervently. This will be an effectual cure. Ought else, in the shape of amicable separation and agreeing to differ and standing aloof from each other because they cannot in all respects think exactly alike, will only be "healing the heart of the daughter of Zion slightly, saying peace, peace, when there is no peace." Secondly. The ministers of Christ have at this day a *highly re-*

sponsible office to discharge. They are not only to "contend earnestly for the faith," but also to be "ensamples to their flock," as in other graces so also in that peculiarly characteristic and attractive temper of the christian, which "believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth." They are not only to preach the truth of Christ; they are also to exemplify the spirit of Christ. They are to hold up to the world a faithful pattern of what the gospel is able to do for all men, in the sweet, subduing, transforming influence which it has had upon their own characters. While they "watch for souls as those who expect to give account;" and while they cease not to "instruct every man and warn every man night and day with tears;" they are also to remember, that in discharging this part of their sacred office, the spirit of mutual esteem and fraternal love among themselves is to breathe in every heart, and control their whole deportment. *Who* should love one another, if it be not the ministers of the gospel of Christ? *Where* should mutual confidence, and peace, and holy concord, dwell, if not in the hearts of those who are the appointed messengers of grace and salvation, from him who is styled "our Peace," to their perishing fellow-men? Where should the vital, the peculiar spirit of the Redeemer reign on earth, if not in us, whose special business it is, in times of calamity and distress, to stand between the porch and the altar, and cry, "Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thy heritage to reproach?" Thirdly. How pertinent, then, at this day and under existing circumstances, is the interrogation of the lawgiver of Israel, addressed to that people at a time and under circumstances not wholly dissimilar from ours, "Who is on the Lord's side?" Who will forget every minor difference, every inferior attachment, every subordinate inquiry, and respond to this great question, by a practical, a full, a cordial taking sides with the *Lord's* party, and by becoming *laborers with Him* in building up his holy kingdom among men? In a little while our work on earth will be done, and we shall rest from our labors. In a little while the petty interests and party collisions of this present evil world will, to us, be at an end, and we shall go up with our people to the bar of Supreme and Impartial Justice. Then, when that day shall arrive, how little will many things appear which now, perhaps, seem great to our imperfect vision! "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease;

whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away ; but *charity* never faileth."

" This is the grace that *lives* and sings,
When faith and hope shall cease ;
'Tis this shall strike our joyful strings,
In the sweet realms of bliss."

ART. III.—ON THE CHARACTER OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Is the Apocalypse of St. John a drama ?

The question whether the Apocalypse of St. John is a drama, is closely connected with the history of the interpretation of this book. The student of the bible, therefore, will regard it as one of some importance.

Hartwig, in his defense of the Apocalypse, published in 1781, was the first who suggested the idea of the Apocalypse being a drama. He divided it into five acts, after the manner of modern tragedies.

The celebrated Eichhorn adopted the view of Hartwig, with some modifications, exhibited it with great taste and talent in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, published in 1791, and defended the same in his various works till his death. He may be regarded as the great advocate of this opinion, and as having collected all, substantially, which can be said in its favor.

The argument of Eichhorn may be summarily stated as follows :

I. The Jews had some acquaintance with classic dramas. Herod the Great built theatres at Jerusalem and Cesarea. His grandson, Herod Agrippa, did the same at Berytus. The Jews, therefore, who *Hellenized*, i. e. imitated the Greeks, in language and in manners, might have followed them in their taste for theatrical exhibitions. Ezekiel, a Jewish writer mentioned by Clemens and Eusebius, and supposed to have lived one century before the Christian era, wrote a tragedy, founded on the history of Moses, of which fragments are still extant.

II. The visions of the Apocalypse are connected in a well digested plan, tending to one result, like the scenes and acts of a drama.

III. The Apocalypse is interspersed with soliloquies, dialogues, (chap. v. 2 ; vii. 3 ; viii. 13, &c.) hymns, (chap. iv. 8, 11 ;

v. 9, 10, 13; vii. 12, &c.) and prayers (chap. vi. 10) of celestial beings, like the machinery of dramatic and epic poetry.

IV. The Apocalypse is all *action*, (this is the literal meaning of the word *drama*,) from beginning to end. If conversation is introduced, still the action does not stop.

Jerusalem and Rome are destroyed, and a heavenly Jerusalem is exhibited. Are not these actions? says Eichhorn. These three principal events are each preceded by other events, which prepare the way for, and lead to them. Before the destruction of Jerusalem, the country is thrown into confusion by rebels and zealots, and the city is besieged by the Roman armies. Then follows the overthrow of the city. Before the destruction of Rome, its impending ruin is announced by angels, and symbolically represented by a harvest and vintage. Then follows the destruction. Before the appearance of the heavenly Jerusalem, the dead are awakened, the judgment is held, and the citizens of the new community collected. Then the new city is sent down from heaven. Is not the Apocalypse action throughout?

The visions of the Apocalypse are founded, according to Eichhorn, on a Jewish notion, that whatever takes place on earth is first determined upon in heaven, and then acted over there in the presence of God and his angels. To know future events, then, it was only necessary to be admitted to the sight of these representations.

In answer to these arguments, it may be said,

I. That Eichhorn himself has made several important admissions. (1.) That it is a drama altogether singular and unique in its kind. (2.) That it is a symbolical drama. Jerusalem is a symbol or emblem of Judaism; Rome, of Paganism; and the new Jerusalem, of Christianity; and so of the subordinate symbols. Of course, in the Apocalypse events are represented by symbols, which are occasionally connected or explained by words, while in the common drama events are described by words only. (3.) That it is a religious drama; of course in its moral bearing, wide apart from all ordinary dramas. (4.) That it is a prophetic drama. In the common drama, past events are brought forward, here future events are represented. (5.) That it is rather a description of a drama. With these few admissions on the part of Eichhorn, it would seem as if there could be nothing in the name of drama worth contending for.

II. Although the Jews, in the time of John, might have had some acquaintance with theatrical exhibitions, yet it is

not probable, that a serious-minded Jew, much less a Jewish christian, would have imitated a heathen drama. Every thing about such a drama would have been too closely associated in his mind with the idolatry and abominations of paganism.

III. Although the visions are connected, as is natural, into a consistent whole ; yet the unities of the classic drama, that of time, of place, and of action, are wanting, with the exception perhaps of the last.

IV. Although it is admitted, that there is something in the Apocalypse analogous to the machinery of the classic drama, yet it is also true, that the artificial divisions of the drama are not always found in the book itself, that dramatic terms are altogether wanting, and that the personages of the piece are often in conversation with the author himself, which, according to writers on rhetoric, is inconsistent with the fundamental idea of a drama.

V. The word drama primarily denoted *action*, but as a term of art it denotes *a particular mode of representing action in written composition*, and the question before us is, whether the Apocalypse belongs to this form of composition. It is this question which we are obliged to answer in the negative.

VI. However plausible the assertion of Eichhorn may seem, that the Apocalypse is founded on the rabbinical notion, that whatever takes place on earth is first acted over in heaven, yet on close inspection this opinion of Eichhorn will appear destitute of proof. The scenes of the Apocalypse are laid partly on earth and partly in heaven ; on earth, because the events are really to transpire there ; in heaven, to show that they are ordered of God, and proceeded, as it were, from his throne. This simple view will explain the whole appearance, on which Eichhorn builds so much.

VII. It lies much nearer to compare the Apocalypse with the visions of the ancient prophets, than with the productions of the Grecian muse. With the former it agrees in all the minute details, as in moral sentiment, in diction, in images, &c. It differs from them only in this respect, that the vision is more protracted than any which is found in the old prophets. If we make the Apocalypse of St. John a drama, then, to be consistent, we must make the visions of the prophets fragments of dramas, which the advocates of a dramatic Apocalypse will hardly claim.

In coincidence with this view, we would define the Apoca-

lypse thus: *An account of a connected series of symbolical visions, for the most part of a prophetic nature, and described in elevated poetic language.*

In our opinion then, the Apocalypse is not strictly a drama. But the suggestion of Eichhorn has made an epoch in the history of this book. His mode of interpreting the Apocalypse has rescued it from the reproach under which it labored prior to his time, and has placed it on a par with the other writings of the new testament. Although Eichhorn's principle of interpreting this book may be modified by the labors of future critics, there is no prospect, that the old mode of viewing it will ever be revived in its full strength.

ART. IV.—CHRISTIANITY AN ESSENTIAL WANT OF HUMAN NATURE.

It is the aim of the bible to produce in the soul a lively feeling of the need of christianity. Such a feeling is indispensable to a due appreciation of this system of grace and mercy to man. Hence God, in his word, has addressed those considerations to sinners, which are fitted to convince them of their need of the gospel salvation. They are taught, that an interest in religion is necessary at all times, and that it will be apt especially to be felt as essential, in the hour of their departure from life. When their flesh and their heart faileth, they will learn, perhaps too late, if they have not attended to the subject before, that God only can be the strength of the heart, and the soul's everlasting portion. In agreement with this divine monition, it is a fact, that most men desire an interest in religion, considered in reference to its consequences. At least, this is the case when they are called to leave the world. Such a circumstance determines, in some measure, the worth of evangelical piety. We may be in a condition in which we shall feel its importance, either in its supports or in the regret that we are destitute of it. By nature we are at all times in a situation in which the gospel should be felt to be indispensable; or in other words, *christianity is an essential want of human nature.* For what is our condition by nature? A few particulars may give the answer, as well as furnish the proof required in support of our proposition. To specify the most prominent:

1. Our *moral ruin*. A sense of this want must arise eminently from the fact of our lost condition, as the intelligent, accountable creatures of God. That such *is* our condition, is a truth imperatively forced upon us, both by scripture and reason—both by experience and observation. We feel it in all our nature, and in all our relations. Our moral ruin is our depravity and our sin. Hence it is, that mankind are prone to forget God, to neglect his service, to disobey his will, to be ungrateful, sensual, malignant, vindictive, to be false, covetous, oppressive, and implacable. Our moral disorders and degradation, when not counteracted by providential and spiritual influences, are extreme. All men in a state of nature show, that they are corrupt at heart. Here incurable evils prevail; and such is the state of human perversity, that no crime to which there is an adequate temptation or the hope of present impunity, has been avoided from want of a wicked heart. Sinners are lost and alienated from God, and, previously to conversion, often manifest a most determined hostility to his law and truth. They are wont to rise up against his authority, in open acts of rebellion, and will not that Christ should reign over them. Every sort of wrong and injustice, also, have they committed against one another. In a state of impenitence, hateful and unholy passions predominate, and no other prospect is before the soul, than their everlasting prevalence. In subjection to such a ruin, who does not perceive the necessity of christianity, as a remedy? Who does not perceive its necessity, as a means of averting a state of things so fraught with evil and disorder—especially of doing away its ultimate, eternal effects? Every one who views the subject aright, must have a deep sense of the want of just such a scheme of religion as the bible contains—a religion allowing no countenance to sin, condemning it in every act and feature, threatening the wrath of God against the wicked, and insisting on entire and perpetual obedience to the divine law;—a religion which discovers and proposes the only way of recovery for sinning men, through the righteousness and atonement of Jesus Christ. Who should not leap for joy, that he may escape from the bondage of sin and guilt, and be restored to moral purity and the favor of God! What can give strength to the heart, when the flesh and body fail, except that holiness which is found in the gospel, and through its instrumentality!

2. Our *misery* as sinners, decisively evinces our need of an interest in the salvation of the gospel. The religion of the bible

is revealed for the use of miserable men. It affords the only relief and antidote to their sufferings, and there can be only sorrow and disappointment where this religion is not enjoyed. There can be only eternal infelicity where it is not possessed. Aversion to God and to his truth is a wretched state of mind. Many have felt this misery, while they have been conscious of their opposition to the divine requirements, and to the way of salvation through Jesus Christ. Sinners feel it in their convictions of sin, and it is a foretaste of hell. How numerous are the sorrows of life in consequence of the original apostasy! Especially, how do their sorrows multiply, who *hasten* after idols! As sinners wander from God, they depart from happiness. Their hopes and comforts wither and die. They can take true satisfaction in nothing, let their treasures in the world be ever so abundant, or their prospects in life ever so flattering. In every scene of sensuality or pleasure, the wrath of God is mingled; yea, go whither they will, it hangs over their path. "*Lo! they that wander far from thee shall perish; thou hast destroyed all them that go a whoring from thee.*" In their falseness—their unfaithfulness to God and to their own, they suffer his displeasure, the pangs of conscience, and fearful anticipations of coming evil; and without repentance, they are destined to a fiery, everlasting doom. When the day of death arrives, how miserable often are those who have neglected religion and their souls! Their pleasures are ceased, and their torments are begun. Some, instead of looking to God for pardon and relief, avenge themselves on their friends or dependents, on account of their distresses. Some even curse and find fault with those who have sought to do them good. An eminent English author, of the last century, a man of the world, who wrote much, and not bad things either, when he found himself distressingly sick, (and it proved to be his last sickness,) cursed his friend and physician, on account of the medicine which had been sent by the latter. The sick man thought, falsely indeed, that a mistake had been made in the medicine, and the wrong kind administered. Oh, the sinner in his wretchedness, in the near prospect of death, blames others, it may be, and sometimes himself; but it is then almost always, if not literally always too late for the purposes of reformation and relief. Had God been sought in season; had the remedy pointed out in his word been applied according to its design, how much suffering would have been avoided in this apostate world! what horror of conscience, what dismay, what despair, would have been averted from the souls of sin-

ners! Who then does not see the necessity of christianity, in view of the deep misery which sinners experience in this life, and the deeper misery to which they are exposed hereafter? What can afford relief, and brighten their prospects, especially as to their coming eternity, except an interest in the gospel? No one of our fallen race can hope to escape eternal misery, but by going to the Almighty Savior, and submitting soul and body to him.

3. We may advert to those *desires for good which yet remain in human nature*—those secret and strong aspirations for enjoyment, and even for a better portion than this world can give, of which especially the cultivated mind is almost always conscious. Those desires point to the system of truth and love revealed from heaven. At least, they can be satisfied with nothing less than this. Amid the ruins of human nature, and the fearful depravity of the soul, there is yet perceivable a spark of the unquenchable beam, with which God originally inspired man. The world does not satisfy the mind which seeks it, for the mind was made for something nobler and better. After every object of earthly desire is obtained, still the soul sighs for a higher enjoyment. The inquiry has come down from all antiquity—"Who will show us good?" And the complaint has ever been made of earth's vanity, after its possessions have been tried. What, then, shall satisfy the soul, but a superior and heavenly good? It is not affirmed or supposed, that the real nature of that good—its spiritual and holy nature—is perceived, or that it would be relished, could it be actually possessed by the impenitent sinner; yet he wants a better portion—something more satisfactory than he has hitherto attained. The soul pants after enjoyment which is unlimited—which can never end, or decay, or pall upon the senses. Now what portion can that be, but God? What system of truth and goodness can answer the purpose, but that of the gospel? The soul sanctified by its influence cries out, like the philosopher of old, when he had solved a mathematical proposition, "I have found it; I have found it." This remnant of primeval feelings, or this resemblance of them, shows impressively the need of christianity. Every enlightened mind perceives, that there must be something like the system of the gospel, in order to advance man towards the perfection and happiness for which he was originally created. He must fail of the great end of his being, unless he is specially interested in the evangelical scheme of mercy. Unless its redeeming power is felt in his heart, and its spirit is wrought

into his very moral texture, he must come short of good. He must eternally languish for his appropriate blessedness. All the universe of God cannot satisfy him without it. "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul," and its capacity of enjoyment! They who have possessed most of the world without religion, have been no more contented than others placed in different worldly circumstances, and in most instances far less contented and happy. The "great things" and stimulating pleasures which are so much desired by sinners, have, besides diminishing their real happiness, rendered them more insensible to divine influences, and less disposed to seek after God and his love.

4. Consider our *dependence on God for life and the blessings of time*. This system of divine, infinite benevolence, secures for us, as far as may be, life and its attendant favors. In making sure of the greater mercy, it promises the less. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things!" Our dependence for life and a continuance in a world of probation, for safety and success in business, for health and friends, for food, raiment, and shelter, is a real dependence, and is more or less felt by mankind in general. It ought to be deeply felt. We are frail creatures at the best, exposed to innumerable evils and dangers, and none can protect and conduct us safely through the world, but the God of patience and of power. His unwearied benevolence can alone suffice to supply these urgent wants. To whom, then, can we go, but to God in Christ, for those lesser blessings which he has to give, as well as for the greater? Bestowing the greater upon sinners, he will not withhold the smaller. The mercy which soothes the sinner's anguish of mind, by granting a full and free pardon when penitence is exercised, assures us, that life will be continued, so long as God, in his wisdom, shall deem our life to be an object. The divine care will not be the less exercised over our temporal concerns, because it is exercised over our spiritual concerns. God will not neglect our body because he has made provision for our souls. His omnipotence is adequate to the care of both. His infinite kindness yearns to secure for us the benefits of both worlds, and of all duration. Only submit to his will, confide in him, and surrender ourselves, and all we possess, into his hands, and we are safe. Life and its blessings will be continued so long as shall be consistent with the divine designs and our own benefit; and when

the powers of the body shall become extinct, as they ultimately must, then God will take to himself our immortal spirits.

5. In the *social condition* in which we are placed, having an unavoidable connection with others, it is obvious to acknowledge our need of the gospel. We cannot but feel it under circumstances in which our selfishness and individual wants often conflict with the public welfare, and with that of each other. Society cannot exist in safety and comfort without the influence of the religion of the bible. There would be endless wars, collisions, oppressions, frauds, jealousies, encroachments on others' rights, without the restraining, harmonizing principles of the gospel. These evils abound in proportion to the absence of religious knowledge and feeling from a people. Society owes all its value to christian institutions and influences. What enlightened person, and well-wisher to mankind, would desire to live where law and order do not exist, or are customarily trampled upon—where the gospel is not preached, or where it is preached corruptly—where the sabbath is not enjoyed, or where it is almost universally profaned, as it is in some nominally christian countries—where the ordinances of public worship are unknown, or are generally neglected. In vain are even learning and refinement, arts and general education, possessed without the operation of religious knowledge and principle. Those influences cannot prevent the existence of degeneracy and corruption, or resist their progress in the community when they have once taken root.

In this land, we should have no prospect of ultimate stability and happiness, or the removal or mitigation of moral disorders, without the subduing influences of the truths of religion. Our liberty, security, peace, comforts, and possessions, would all be at the mercy of the uncontrolled selfishness and depravity of the unprincipled and vicious. Riot and murder and wrong, vastly more than they now do, would afflict and distress every portion of the country. All the safety and beneficial operation of our institutions, depend on the religion of the bible. In many instances they are founded on that religion, or professedly so—they are interwoven with its maxims and usages—and if the gospel ceases to have efficacy, our institutions themselves must change, or cease. All discerning and correct men now look to religion as our only safeguard, and the spring of our prosperity as a people. The great controlling, harmonizing principles of the gospel, connected with general education, are looked for and sought to bear on the

consciences and hearts of the community. And here is our *only* hope. It is God in his truth; God by his spirit; filling, sanctifying, comforting, and guiding the minds of men. Our nation is ruined without the prevalence of christianity, and, perhaps, its much greater prevalence. The religion of the gospel, we repeat it, is our all. And wonderful is its purifying power, and especially would this be so, were its influence unresisted. A writer, speaking of the systems and maxims of other ages than those of the gospel, says: "A few pages of the sacred volume of christianity, contain more moral truth, beauty, and excellence, than all the subtle or fanciful speculations of Pythagoreans and Eclectics, Academics and Peripatetics, Cynics and Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics, or of all the sects of all antiquity;" and that in these speculations "we see the intense meditations, the laborious devotion, the sacrifice of all other earthly considerations to this one pursuit, by the most refined and acute intellects of the most enlightened countries for more than a thousand years, exerted in a fruitless search for an unobjectionable system of morals, which scripture reveals to us in a small space, and in the simplest forms." It may be added, that it was impossible for men uninspired, and under the influence of depravity, to discover the principles, that universally lead nations and individuals to order, safety, holiness, and felicity. In the christian revelation we have the invaluable means to this end, and woe be to us if we neglect them—if we do not make a right, diligent, and thorough use of this great mercy of heaven.

6. Think also of our *prospects for a coming eternity*. To sinners, the expectations of an after-state of being and of eternal retributions, can be no other than a gloomy one. Futurity is shrouded in darkness and terror to our fallen race. The gloom has never been penetrated except by the gospel. An angry God and a just judgment can alone be presented to the view of a depraved, alienated mind. Aside from christianity and the hope of its mercy—aside from christianity and the operation of its principles, there can be no comfort in contemplating a future eternal state of existence. As unreconciled and unforgiven, we have obviously no good to expect. A long eternity of condemnation and anguish, of sinning, and of the reign of malignant passions, seems to be the only portion of unholy men. A fearful conviction of this truth is very apt to fasten itself on the dying sinner, if with views at all enlightened he then contemplates the future; and hence the necessity of God's merciful interposition at that period. He only

can bear us up in the hour of final and solitary departure. His gracious presence only can irradiate the darkness of the resting places of the dead. Oh, the prospects of the dying, impenitent sinner, growing darker and darker as his soul approaches an unpropitiated God and a forgotten Savior! His anxieties and his cries for mercy now are not regarded. The die is cast for eternity. Not the pleasures of time—no, nor the possession of the whole world, were they possible, should tempt any to be unprepared for that day. How fearful the calamity, should it come upon us unawares and in our sins, only resolving, perhaps, to become religious, at best only intending to be religious at some future time! Such a delusion should be dispelled; nor should our souls be cheated of infinite good, or needlessly exposed to endless ruin.

These remarks might be greatly extended, but we hasten towards a conclusion, in offering a few illustrations of a different kind, and designed to be applied both to individuals and communities of men.

It is a deep sense of the need of just such a religion as the bible reveals, which has turned the attention of vast multitudes of souls towards it, and been the means of their illumination and eternal life. The manner in which this result is usually brought to pass on the sinner's part, may be described in a single paragraph. He first obtains a lively feeling of want, by viewing his condition as it is—as that of a dying, sinful, condemned creature, and hastening towards an awful judgment and retribution. He feels that he needs the mercy of God, pardon, reconciliation, and peace. With this feeling he will not long be easy, indifferent, or inactive. He will dread the terrible condemnation and punishment of the impenitent, and will inquire into the method of escape. This inquiry, honestly and earnestly begun, will issue favorably. It has so issued in regard to all those who have given such an attention to the subject. They have found the power of religion in their souls, in submitting to the terms of the Lord's righteousness and grace. The feeling, then, of need, produced by reflection on God's truth, and followed out in a penitent and believing application to the great propitiary sacrifice, constitutes, in brief, the history of a soul renewed to holiness and reconciled to God. Let the reader, therefore, who is unassured of his interest in the gospel, cultivate a deep sense of his need of the mercy of God, revealed in the plan of redemption. Let his mind dwell upon it, and let him hail the preaching of the gospel as the great instrument employed by the

Holy Spirit in producing such a conviction. Let him come under the blessed sound, and be willing to be disturbed for his good. Let him invite the keen edge of the truth. Here it will wound and probe the soul, for the healing of its moral corruption. But not so hereafter. Then

“The keen vibration of bright truth is hell.”

It was a lively apprehension of the need of just such a religion as the bible reveals, that saved other civilized nations from the vortex that swallowed France, and portions of continental Europe generally, in the revolution of the former, and in the sceptical principles that had infected both. Great Britain and its dependencies and the United States were saved. In Great Britain there was a profound feeling of the necessity of christianity, as an individual possession and in the social state, notwithstanding the prevalence of much corruption in the nation. A similar feeling, also, prevailed in the United States, though here a too great relaxation of the primitive doctrine and discipline had appeared, and especially after the revolutionary struggle, corruption had too extensively spread. There existed, nevertheless, wherever the English tongue was spoken, and its vast treasured wisdom was embodied in religious treatises and in immortal works of genius, and especially wherever the pure gospel was preached, a deep-settled conviction of the need of christianity, and consequently infidelity did not take with the body of the people. They possessed too much good sense and religious knowledge, as is the fact with the great body of the people in Protestant communities, to be seduced to their ruin; and this, notwithstanding infidel and licentious books, in those times, were everywhere industriously circulated. In the early part of life, we recollect to have met with them where now probably they are not to be found, or would be received with little favor. For a season, at least, the feeling that the gospel was necessary, saved these nations. The mass of the people could not be reasoned or ridiculed out of their wants; though individuals among them yielded to the seductive influence and perished.

It is a strong conviction of the necessity of just such a religion as the bible contains, which is to save our nation at the present period of excitement and alarm, and in some sense of calamity. It is truly a period of difficulty, with so many conflicting interests—pecuniary, political, and moral—to settle and adjust. We must hold upon the elementary principles of religion, amidst the chaos and collision of human opinions.

We must hold upon the bible as our impregnable fortress, the rock of our strength. We must hold upon the constitution of our country, as the patriot might expect us to say ; but it is unnecessary to say this, if we retain our grasp on the bible. That includes all—that will save us. Embraced in its genuine spirit, it will calm the waves of passion—it will say, "Peace, be still," to the elements of strife and disorder ; and its mighty voice will be obeyed. We want a general reformation—a vivid pervading sense of the need of vital religion, throughout our whole community. We want the general prevalence of gospel principles, and a thorough, national repentance. If the aim is wholly at the removal of particular evils, and these are attacked in an isolated manner, and every one, as it is successively brought into view, represented by its advocates as the greatest scourge of the land ; there is danger of disproportion and excess in the means employed, and of partial, or injurious results. In this case we wish to carry our favorite particular measure—we would obtain a victory, though at too great an expense to the general interests of christianity. The particular evil must be put down at any hazard, and by any means ; by private calumny or public persecution ; by formal arraignment or extra-judicial decision : whereas a large and just view would take in the whole concurrent influence of the gospel—the analogy of the divine operations—the proportion of faith—and the ultimate triumph of correct principles and practices throughout the community. At such a time, it is a fearful mistake to prejudice or sour the minds of men against the gospel, and indispose them to hear its claims, by unwonted ascetic doctrines and a spirit of denunciation and intolerance. Rather let the broad surface of truth be turned up to view—the whole connection, dependence, and proportion of christian doctrines, be exhibited—the real spirit of kindness and catholicism, which the gospel breathes, be acted out in the advocacy of the great cause ; and then we may hope for the ear of the nation, and for the favoring providence and all-powerful Spirit of God. This, whether it shall be called old school divinity, or new school—old measures or new—moderation or ultraism, it is thought is the way in which religion has heretofore proved its power on the hearts of men, and is destined hereafter to prove it. This, it is believed, would give harmonious views and harmonious action to many angry disputants—adjust and modify individual projects and measures—and tend to secure the various specific objects of religion and charity, so far as it is wise to

prosecute them separately. Let the power of holiness be manifested, and God be sought and felt as the all-comprehending good; then all subordinate plans and means will be adjusted, and contention, jealousy, and sectarian views, as well as other influences hostile to the progress of christianity, would disappear from the professors of piety and the advocates of benevolence.

Finally: It is a strong feeling of the necessity of religion and the consciousness—the humble hope of possessing it, which prepare the soul, in every hour of danger and trial, to seek and find a refuge that can never fail. Here is the full explanation of the comfort of a christian death-bed. They who have looked for consolation in a reconciled God and from eternity—who have found their happiness in the services of religion, experience little regret in the hour of their departure, as to the loss of any earthly interests. They regard their good things, good things unmixed with evils, as now at hand. They are leaving their trials, and their darkness, their sorrows, and their sins. Their hope sustains them, and God their Redeemer forsakes them not. Yea, he holds them up and solaces their spirits. It is the province and the effect of christianity received into the heart and acted out in the life, to carry the christian comfortably, and sometimes triumphantly, through this scene. If a virtuous heathen, enlightened only by nature, could say, as he held the deadly bowl which he was obliged to drink, that “he seemed not so much to be driven to death, as to ascend into the skies,” much more may a christian enlightened by revelation and approved of his Savior, utter the language of confidence or of triumph. The gospel has, in some instances, realized the delightful idea which is shadowed forth, in what has been said of the death of the swan—perhaps fabulously said, that it is accompanied by songs and by ecstasy.* The departure of christians from life, has been at times soothing to the sufferer, and cheering to the survivor, in the highest degree. Such death-beds are indeed not very common cases; we speak of the full effects and supports of religion; but no believer is permitted to despair of attaining to them. For this purpose, especial care must be taken of our hearts and lives. There must be a particular and actual preparation for the scene. We must cultivate that state of mind which an eminent man, celebrated throughout the world

* Cic. Tusc. Quaest. “Cum cantu et voluptate moriantur.”

for his productions in the fine arts, intimated was his own, when he said, that "no fancy arose in his mind, but death was sculptured on it"—when he also said, "if life pleases us, death being a work of the same master, ought not to displease us"—and when, furthermore, he said, that "we ought not to show that joy when a child is born," referring to the rejoicings customary on such an occasion, "which should be reserved for the death of one who has lived well." Truly indeed, we must *live well*—we must live in a holy manner—we must live by faith in the Son of God, if we would die in the Lord, and in the comforts of the Lord's presence and love.

ART. V.—THE DUTY OF CHRISTIAN SYMPATHY IN THE
MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE.

"Circular Letter of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Missionaries, on curtailing their expenditures, June, 1837."

"Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the A. B. C. F. M., September, 1837."

THE documents which we have placed at the head of this article, have for some time been before the public; and with their contents, the most of our readers are doubtless familiar. In making them the basis of a few remarks, relative to the cause of missions, our design is not so much to direct attention to their various details, as to point out and enforce the duties which they most imperatively impose upon the christian community. That our Boards for foreign and domestic missions, should suffer in consequence of the storm of financial derangement and bankruptcy which has swept over the country, we do not think surprising. We believe, notwithstanding, they will soon cease to feel its effects, if the church can be made duly to sympathise in their present embarrassments. The essential elements of wealth and prosperity, still exist in our country. They are placed within the reach and control of those who profess to hold all things in subservience to the will of Christ, not less than of others; and if such can be roused to a full conviction of their responsibilities, in view of the present exigencies of the church, we doubt not her course abroad, as well as at home, will still be onward.

It should never be forgotten, that the cause of christian missions, is identical with that of true religion itself. The final command of Christ was, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing

them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is under this command, and with the credentials of christian teachers, that the missionaries of the cross go forth. The message which they bear to the heathen, is the same message of glad tidings which has been announced wherever the name of Jesus has been proclaimed. The object for which they labor, and to which their lives are devoted, is the advancement of his kingdom. Hence their cause is the cause of christianity itself; and whatever serves to throw obstacles in the way of the one, cannot fail to depress the other. With these considerations before us, we cannot but feel, that sentiments of shame and grief should pervade the church, in view of the facts presented by the recent Circular of the American Board, to the missionaries under its care.

After briefly detailing the financial operations of the Board for the year preceding, and stating the existing condition of the treasury, this document expresses the conviction, that at the next annual meeting there would be a debt of not less than \$45,000. It then states, as follows, the results to which the committee had been forced to come by existing facts:

‘1. On the 9th of May, the Committee were constrained to decide, that the five missionaries, who were ready and expecting to go forth the present month, could not be sent, in the existing state of the treasury; and how soon they can be, is now utterly uncertain.

2. A circular letter is about being sent to the other thirty clerical missionaries, who have received appointments, and most of whom will be ready and desirous to go next autumn, telling them that, according to present indications, they should make their arrangements for remaining in the country at least another year.

3. On the 20th of the present month, the Committee, on the further consideration of the financial state and prospects of the Board, resolved, “That it is their unavoidable though painful duty to reduce the remittances to the missions under their care *forty thousand dollars* below the recent estimate for the coming year, so that the annual expenditure of the Board, including the existing debt, shall not exceed \$230,000.”

4. At the same meeting the Committee also resolved, “That, should the average monthly receipts fall short of \$19,000, *a further reduction will be necessary.*”

This reduction was proportioned by the Committee among the several missions, and the secretaries were instructed to inform you, that your expenses must by all means be brought within the assigned limits. This necessity cannot be more painful to you than it is to us. If the excision deprives you of your right arm, it deprives us of ours; and *we* are so situated, as to be constrained to sympathize with all the missions, and suffer with all. Distressing as the necessity is, the reduction can no

longer be avoided. God in his holy providence has rendered it *our* duty and *your* duty, and it must be made. The reduction from the late appropriation to your mission for the year ending July 31, 1838, is —, and the sum now stands at —. Unless a knowledge of this retrocession in our work shall rouse the churches to a serious consideration of the subject, so that by vigorous and healthful acts of self-denial they shall bring a sudden and great accession to our receipts, a greater sum cannot be afforded you. You are not expected to add to it by drafts on the Treasurer of the Board. From the time you receive this letter, and till otherwise instructed by the Committee, your annual expenses should not exceed the sum above named; and this is designed to cover both your expenses on the ground and the purchases made for you at home. It is a sum total, and the mission will make the best possible use of it. Probably it will be the rate of our remittance to you, until the missionaries now under appointment are on their way to their fields. Should your expenses be suffered to exceed the specified sum, the effect of every thousand dollars must be to detain one of the missionaries who are now waiting to be sent.

You suffer, dear brethren, not alone. The Greek and Nestorian missions each makes sacrifices to the amount of \$1,000; the Smyrna and Singapore missions, each \$1,500; the Syrian, \$1,750; the Constantinople, \$2,000; the Mahrattas, \$3,500; the South India, \$4,800; the Ceylon, \$5,000; the Sandwich Islands, \$5,600; the missions to the Indian tribes, \$10,000. It is not necessary to enumerate all the missions which suffer; these will suffice. We know, and the churches will know, that these reductions are effected only by disbanding schools, reducing printing establishments, stopping printing-presses, arresting the progress of seminaries, etc., etc. But then there is no alternative. The Board can remit only what it receives. The community does not, and so far as we can see will not, at present, furnish adequate means. Your expenses must therefore be reduced, at any sacrifice, to the prescribed limits; or greater evils—affecting the credit and stability of the Board, the sending forth of missionaries, and your own personal support—will ensue. We humbly hope, that in answer to prayer the days of this severe visitation will be shortened, and that great good will be the ultimate result; but it will be good brought out of much evil.

We fear that a still further reduction will be necessary, before we have seen an end to the present distress; but our waiting eyes are unto God, and yours will be in the same direction.' *Miss. Her.* vol. xxxiii., pp. 346, 347.

To this language of the Circular the August number of the *Missionary Herald* adds the following remarks:

'A letter of this nature could no longer be safely delayed, and the painful reductions required of the missionaries cannot now be wholly prevented. But they may be prevented in part. This lamentably *retrograde* movement may be arrested. The beloved missionaries may

be relieved from the heart-breaking task of undoing what they have done with so much prayer and labor, and from the bitter disappointment of not only not receiving other brethren to their aid, when most urgently needed, but of being shorn, also at the same time, of their customary facilities for exerting a wide and effectual influence on the heathen. The necessity of those further reductions, which must be almost destructive to some of the missions, may be saved. The Board, unaided, has no power to do this, nor have the executive committee and officers. The responsibility rests upon the christian community. They, with the divine blessing, can do it. Only let them realize the importance of the occasion, the necessity of immediate action, and that the result is to be attained by every one doing something, though it be but little. Then the grief of the missionaries will soon give place to joy, and they will soon resume their onward career.

But, it should be fully understood, *that, if prompt and special efforts be not made by the patrons of the missions now under the care of the Board, those missions must suffer distressing reductions; the more distressing, because, through the blessing of God, they are now, with few exceptions, in the full tide of successful operation.*' p. 347.

The report made at the late anniversary meeting of the Board shows the estimates of the committee, by virtue of which, the above circular was issued, to have been substantially correct. The Society is still above \$40,000 in debt. Forty-four missionaries and assistant missionaries are under appointment, but waiting for the funds requisite to send them to their fields of labor. Others, too, it is known, have been discouraged from offering their services to the Board, by the detention of those already under appointment.

That a necessity should have existed for the retrograde movements in the cause of missions, which these facts develop, we say, cannot be otherwise than painful and mortifying to every disciple of Christ. We deem this, then, a suitable occasion for calling the attention of our readers to *the duty of christian sympathy towards those who are engaged in the missionary enterprise.*

By christian sympathy, we mean, that sympathy which is inspired by christian principle; which hence, like all true religious feeling, spends itself not in fruitless emotion, but in prompt and vigorous action. We mean that participation in the feelings of others, which is founded upon the love that seeketh not its own—upon that enlarged and disinterested benevolence which prompts those who are under its influence to share in the feelings and fortunes of all who have claims upon their regards—to weep with those who weep, to rejoice with those who re-

joice, and, by labors and sacrifices, to strive for the promotion of their happiness. Between that sympathy for others, whose sincerity and whose depth are thus tested by action, and that sickly sentimentality which extends not beyond sighs and tears and passionate expressions, there is a wide and radical difference. The one is like the clear and steady light of the sun; the other, like the flickering of the taper, or the flashing of the meteor. The one is emphatically *christian* sympathy, and flows from the depths of christian principle; the other has nothing that essentially partakes of religion. Under the influence of the one, we are made to pity and weep over suffering humanity; by the other, we are urged to steady and untiring effort for its relief. Were we to look in the sacred volume for illustrations of the feeling which we have thus described, we should seek for them in those records of missionary enterprise which are presented in the Acts of the Apostles. When Paul set his face towards Jerusalem, not knowing the things that might befall him there, the mere sentimentalist might have admired his heroic daring. The current of his feelings might have been ruffled, and perhaps deeply agitated for a moment, by sympathy with the mingled emotions that pressed upon the apostle's mind. But look at the Ephesian elders. When they thought of the sweet communion which they had enjoyed with him in the fellowship of the gospel—of the hopes, and the joys, and the consolations, which with him they cherished, when he sojourned in their habitations, and remembered, that now they were to see his face no more; their hearts were filled with sorrow, nigh unto bursting. They fell upon his neck and kissed him, and attended him to the ship, and followed him in their thoughts, and, by the single-hearted zeal which, in common with all the primitive disciples, they ever after manifested, in ministering to the necessities of those who proclaimed the gospel, gave evidence of the depth and purity of their feelings.

Now it is a sympathy like this, whose springs lie thus low in the fountains of christian love, which is steady as well as strong, which is lasting as well as quick, which will bear the test of action as well as of excitement, that all are called upon to exercise towards those who have embarked in the missionary enterprise. When they go forth from the pleasant places of their childhood and youth, and, at the calls of duty, turn their backs upon the land of their fathers, whoever possesses the spirit by which they are actuated, will indeed be deeply pained at the violence which is done to the ties of kindred and

affection. But he will give them yet more decisive evidences of heartfelt sympathy. He will send them forth with the tokens of present regard and the assurances of future remembrance. He will not satisfy himself with exclamations of surprise and admiration at what he may regard as great self-denial and holy enterprise in the service of God. By such manifestations of feeling, he might foster in them spiritual pride, and thus unfit them for their high and sacred duty. If they have the true missionary spirit, he cannot in this way sympathize with them. With the substantial tokens of his regard, he will rather breathe out his desires for their welfare and success into the ears of God. But in connection with these general views, it may be proper to mention some of the particulars, in relation to which the sympathy in question should be exercised.

1. In the first place, it should be awakened in view of the *sacrifices* of the missionary life. The nature and extent of these sacrifices, doubtless vary with the varied circumstances of different cases. But that in all cases they are very great—greater than can be well-conceived of—are, by those who have made them, few will question. Home and friends and country, whose associations of endearment and love are inwrought with the very fibres of the heart, are all to be relinquished by him, whose love for Christ and the souls of men, prompts him to go forth as a missionary of the cross. In such a relinquishment, there is an abandonment in life of every thing which is deemed most desirable by those whose hearts are not pervaded by the love of the gospel, and of much, too, which even to himself is scarcely less dear than his own earthly existence. His back must be turned upon the scenes of his childish sports, and the circles of his long-cherished friendships; upon the altars at which he has so often prayed, and the sanctuaries in which his vows have been so many times renewed. They must all be held as nothing, when placed in the balance against what he deems the claims of duty, and we ask if it is a cross of ordinary burden, which they in the sacrifice of kindred feeling, of social enjoyments, of intellectual pleasures, and of religious privileges, he takes upon himself to bear? Is it a light matter for one who loves even the stranger in a distant country, to break away from the friends and the scenes of his native land? And when he does it, by reason of the constraining love of Christ, ought he not largely to share in the sympathies of those who are left behind.

2. But in the second place, the sympathy which we are contemplating, should extend to the *wants* of the missionary. If

the maxim be true, that *the laborer is worthy of his hire*, when applied to those who preach the gospel in christian lands, pre-eminently is it so in relation to those who become its heralds in distant and heathen countries. For unless, after they have reached their fields of labor, they experience the continued regard of those by whom they were commissioned and sent forth, in the supply of their wants, how is it possible they should so apply themselves to the great objects of their undertaking, as to approve themselves workmen that need not to be ashamed! How can they so devote themselves, with untiring, simple-hearted zeal, to the business of communicating good to the heathen, as to commend the gospel to their acceptance, and to convince them, while they abstain from all the ordinary modes of acquiring property, and securing worldly aggrandizement, that they seek not theirs but them; and would profit not themselves, but do good to others! In order that they may become acquainted with the intricacies of foreign languages, with the strong and the weak points of long established superstitions, with the best modes of imparting instruction to minds, that are strangers to their own; and then, that they may do that successfully, to which this and much more is only preliminary, time and labor must be requisite, far beyond what can be well conceived of by those who are strangers to the toils of a missionary life. If, then, it is important for them to enter upon such a life, it is equally so, that they should do it with minds free from the pressure of worldly cares, and unfettered by the perplexities of looking out, in a land of strangers, for the means of their daily subsistence. We hence conceive it to be obvious, that if the church be under obligation to send forth missionaries, it is equally her duty to provide for their wants, when they have reached their fields of destination.

3. But again: The *trials* and *discouragements* of the missionary life, are such as to demand, on the part of christians at home, the exercise of the feeling under consideration. After having lived among the lights of a christian country, it surely can be no ordinary trial, and a source of no little discouragement, to be thrown at once into the midnight-darkness of heathenism and idolatry; and after having been nourished in the spiritual life, by the ministrations of experienced guides and teachers, to be cast upon one's own resources, and left to the strength of one's own principles, in the duty of growth in grace and advancement in holiness. But from without as well as within, trials are to be expected. Like Lot, in the

cities of the plain, his soul will often be *vexed by the unlawful deeds of the wicked*. He will see idols of wood and stone usurping the place of the living God. He will see the sabbath profaned, and the obligations of chastity trampled upon. He will see the high places of heathen worship filled with lust and corruption, while cruelty, in its most revolting features, and suffering in its most exquisite forms, are sanctioned even by religion itself. Against this host of evils, resting as they do upon the deep foundations of national character, inwrought with the very structure of society, guarded, too, by the entrenchments that have been reared by hundreds of generations, he has perhaps set himself in array, single-handed.

When, too, to all this, we add the consideration, that his difficulties are often augmented by the opposition of those representatives of christian nations, whom circumstances may have thrown in his way, and whose example, in the face of the heathen, is a libel upon the very name which he bears, is it surprising, that at times weakness should seize upon his resolution, and discouragement weigh upon his spirits? When, moreover, he sees, perhaps, no immediate good accordant with his expectations resulting from his labors, and he finds that he is wearing out his life in laying foundations on which his successors are to build; is it surprising, that his faith should sometimes waver, and his heart grow faint under discouragements and trials like these? The missionary should have all the support and consolation which can be derived from the assurance, that whatever may be true of those around him, there are hearts that beat in unison with his own. He should be permitted to know, that there are those who sympathize with him in all that he feels and suffers. In the encouragements of christian fellowship, and the communication of religious intelligence, he should from time to time have evidence, that others are mindful of the great object for which he is laboring, and, though in different fields, are striving for the cause to which his life has been consecrated.

4. We add once more, that it will be the privilege of those who thus sympathize in the trials and discouragements of the missionary, also to share in his *consolations and supports*. These are doubtless augmented by the very fact, that his sacrifices are so great. God has declared, that it is more blessed to give than to receive; so that we have high authority for pronouncing that man blessed, who, like the true and devoted missionary, gives to Christ not only his time and talents and influence, but life itself. To his field of labor, he

carries the consciousness of having fulfilled his duty; and he doubtless finds much to sustain him in the assurance, that for every new offering of labor and suffering, which he may make in his master's service, a fresh blessing is in reserve for him on high. To all men he can say, as did the apostle to the Ephesian elders, in view of the bonds and afflictions that awaited him in every city: "None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God."

To these consolations, derived from the favor and the blessing of God, others may be added, arising from the pleasure of seeing or anticipating the results of his labors. If in the providence of God he finds the way prepared, and his efforts at once attended with success, he may witness, through his own instrumentality, transformations like those which have occurred in the islands of the Pacific. He may see the idols of heathen worship thrown to the moles and the bats; and the altars that have been stained by human blood, demolished and scattered. He may see the worshipers of devils transformed into the disciples of Jesus Christ; while the thick darkness of heathenism is made to give place to the full splendors of the Sun of Righteousness; and we ask, if in changes like these there is nothing which can afford satisfaction to the missionary—nothing which can inspire the feeling, that his, verily, is a work blessed and glorious above the common lot?

But suppose his labors are not thus cheered by present success, and that like the first Protestant missionary to China, he is compelled to spend years in the business of study and translation, before he can gain access to the minds around him; he has then but to exercise faith in the promises of God, in order to experience the most rich and abundant consolations. In a narrow under-ground apartment, and by the light of an earthen lamp, year after year did Doct. Morrison pursue his toils over the intricacies of the Chinese language. Are we to suppose those years to have been spent in despondency? They were rather years of hope and unwavering faith. He knew, for God had declared it, that the kingdoms of this world were destined to become the kingdom of Jesus Christ. He had faith to anticipate the period, and doubtless, to derive consolation from the anticipation, when the millions of China should read the bible in consequence of his silent and solitary toils.

Thus, also, it is with every missionary, if he is faithful and

devoted. He may draw consolations from the visions of faith. He may fix the anchor of his hopes upon the firm grounds of God's promises, and look with confidence to the unfoldings of his providence and the triumphs of his grace, for evidence that his labors are not in vain. And in these consolations of faith experienced by the missionary, all may share and sympathize who faithfully co-operate with him in his labors. They may do it with the assurance, that when in the beauty and perfection of millennial glory, the temple of God's holiness upon the earth has been finished, it will be seen that their hands have aided in rearing its pillars and polishing its stones.

Among the many considerations which might be adduced in proof that the exercise of the feeling which has now been described, is a matter of christian obligation, our limits permit us to dwell only upon the following :

1. In the first place, the missionaries who are sent forth by the American Board are *representatives* of the American churches, by whom this Board has been organized, and in whose name it is acting. They are engaged in a work, the obligations of which are resting alike upon all the disciples of Christ. Upon the church collectively, as well as upon its individual members, has been imposed the responsibility of proclaiming the gospel to every creature. This responsibility we recognize in the very act of appointing and sending forth our missionaries, and when, under the authority of Christ, we give to them their credentials, we virtually give to them our pledges, as we do also to God, that we will co-operate and sympathize with them in all their labors. So long as we do not ourselves become missionaries, it is through them only that we can fulfill our duty to the heathen, and our obligations to Christ, in the business of publishing his gospel. If, then, we fail to co-operate with them, by affording them every facility in our power, which can contribute to the success of their labors ; not only do we fail to redeem the pledges which have been given, but we are found wanting in the fulfillment of our duty to the perishing heathen. On the records of God we cause ourselves to be enrolled as traitors to the cause which we are bound to support and honor. The obligations under which the few act, who take their lives in their hands, and as the heralds of salvation go forth to distant nations, are imposed by the same command which requires also the thousands who remain at home, to proclaim the gospel to every creature. If they only do their duty when they give their all to this

work, what ought we to think of those disciples who withhold from such even their sympathy and their support?

2. In the next place it should be remembered, that the missionaries of the cross are our *brethren* in the bonds of the gospel; so that the sympathy of which we are speaking, is required by the principles of christian love and fellowship. In common with all who are united to us by these principles—aside from all considerations, arising from the peculiarity of their circumstances and employments—they have claims upon our favorable regards. It is right, that we should distinctly recognize them as brethren, and that as with us, members of the family of Christ, we should extend to them our encouragement and support—that we should feel for them in their sacrifices, that we should mourn with them over their discouragements, and rejoice with them in their success; so that by a mutual interchange of feeling we may make them to see, that though separated from them in the flesh, we are yet with them in the spirit.

Thus much we owe them, simply because they are with us fellow-disciples of the same master. It is their due, because as partakers in the common faith of the gospel, there is between us and them a community of interests and aims and prospects—because to us and to them, with all who are united in the fellowship of the gospel, “there is one body and one spirit; even as we are called in one hope of our calling—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all.” If thus, in the spirit of the gospel, we are not mindful of the unity of the household of Christ, and fail to sympathize with our missionary brethren, in every thing which pertains to them as christians, we do not fulfill the high obligations of brotherly love. We do not give to them that encouragement and support which we owe to them as our brethren.

3. But again: it seems also an important consideration, that the missionaries of the cross are with us *fellow-laborers* in the service of Christ. Even amid the difficulties of this service at home, our enjoyments are enhanced, and our success augmented, by the co-operation and communion of kindred minds. Our hopes of ultimate success, in the triumphs of religion around us, are strengthened, and the toils by which these triumphs are to be achieved, are rendered sweet and delightful by the consciousness, that on every side thousands of hearts are beating in unison with our own, and thousand of hands active in advancing the work to which our own labors are di-

rected. But if in christian lands we need the encouragements of sympathy and co-operation, while engaged in the service of Christ, how needful must they be to those who enter upon this service in countries of heathenism and idolatry? What necessity have they of being cheered and supported in their toils, by the assurance, that under Christ they are companions in service with others who in different fields are laboring for his cause, and that though theirs is a post of danger and of hardship, the remembrances and affectionate regards of thousands who have an interest in the court of Heaven, have been thrown around them as a shield and protection! As their interests too, with ours, are identified with those of the Redeemer's kingdom, it becomes all, wherever may be our fields of labor, to strive together for mutual success, to strengthen each other's hands, to encourage each other's hearts, to bear each other's burdens, and thus by the strength of union and of concert to give efficiency to our mutual efforts.

4. But again: We urge the additional consideration, that all the disciples of Christ, whether missionaries abroad or laborers at home, are alike *pilgrims* upon the earth, and *expectants* of the skies. Their faces are set towards the heavenly Canaan. Their pilgrimage is to the land of blessedness beyond the river of death. For a time their courses are pursued together, and the toils of the way sweetened by the communings of christian friendship, and the interchange of christian offices. But at length their paths separate, while some turn aside, that they may tell those who are dwelling in the habitations of darkness and of spiritual death, of the goodly land to which they are going; and that if possible they may persuade them to become the companions of their pilgrimage.

Now when our missionary brethren thus go forth from the churches with which they have here been connected, upon this errand of mercy, ought we not to give to them the assurances of continued remembrance? Should we not send after them the tokens of undiminished regard, and thus convince them, that our sympathies are with them in all the toils and dangers of their way? Above all, should we not secure for them protection and defense, by commending them to the grace of Him in whose service they have gone forth? And by thus continuing to sympathize with them even to the end of their courses, should we not prepare ourselves for that near and joyful and endless communion of hearts, which awaits the faithful and persevering at the end of their pilgrimage? We may then together share in the recompense of re-

ward, and over countless souls, as jewels plucked from the rubbish of heathenism and idolatry, rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

In the views which have thus far been presented, it will be seen, that we have contemplated the subject merely in its relation to those who, as missionaries, are laboring among the heathen. There is another aspect of it, which we deem equally important, but at which our limits will here permit us only to glance. We refer to its bearing upon those who, in our own country, are called to the care and labor of superintending and supporting christian missions—the Board of Commissioners, Secretaries, Agents, &c. We know of no responsibility, sustained in our country, equal to theirs, unless it be that which devolves upon the highest officers of our government. We are indeed by no means confident, that we should make even this exception. Not that such a responsibility is involved in the mere business of annually collecting and disbursing \$250,000. This forms but an item, and, perhaps, the smallest item, in the elements of their responsibility. In order that they may act intelligently, and with success, in the application of the funds entrusted to their care, questions of no ordinary magnitude must be settled. The measures which they adopt must be chosen with special reference to circumstances. The great scheme of missionary enterprise must be so modified in its application to different fields of labor, as to be suited to their various peculiarities and characteristics. Before the heathen can be converted to Christ, their confidence in the systems of religion at present prevailing among them, must be shaken. Deep-rooted prejudices and associations must be overcome. Long-cherished habits and opinions must be exploded. The ignorant must be taught, and the enlightened convinced. But preliminary to all this, much must be accomplished. Not only the evils against which the missionary's efforts are directed must be understood, but the causes in which they have originated must be fully traced out. Before he can instruct the ignorant, access must be gained to their minds through the medium of their own languages, and before he can successfully contend with the learned, he must become familiar with their prevailing habits of thought and feeling and action. It will hence be seen, that the system of operations which is adopted in relation to any people, must be the result of a full investigation of the most important questions connected with their civil, literary, and religious history. The nature and origin of their institutions, the peculiarities of their

language and literature, together with their advancement in civilization and refinement, should all be understood.

Now it is upon this field of investigation, so wide in its extent, so exhaustless in its subjects of inquiry, and so important in its connections with the ultimate triumphs of the gospel, that they are required to enter, to whose supervision and direction are committed the missionary operations of the church. If the direction of institutions whose operations are confined to our own country, is not without reason thought to involve a responsibility, which demands the highest talents and most elevated piety, what ought we to think of the responsibility of those who have the direction of the numerous stations for missionary labor, now sustained by the American Board? Who can wonder, that under such a weight of responsibility, the strongest and best men of the church should have sunk? And yet this weight must still be borne. The cause to which Worcester, and Evarts, and Cornelius, and Wisner, gave their lives, and which has been hallowed by their death, must still be sustained. It is the cause of a ruined world, and we believe, that no christian can feel as he ought the inspiration of its motives and obligations, without giving his sympathies to those who are laboring for its advancement.

ART. VI.—THE REVOLUTION IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Pastoral and Circular Letters of the General Assembly of 1837. *Philadelphia*, 8vo. pp. 14.

WE have here two letters, dated "Philadelphia, June 8, 1837," and signed, "By order of the General Assembly, David Elliott, Moderator, John McDowell, Stated Clerk." The first is entitled, "Pastoral Letter to the Churches under the care of the General Assembly." The second is a "Circular Letter," and is inscribed "to all the churches of Jesus Christ." The object of the two letters is one, namely, to vindicate the violent and revolutionary proceedings of the majority in the last General Assembly. The first is plausible, and as courteous, perhaps, in manner and matter, as was consistent with the work to be done. The second is bitter and abusive, and would seem to have been indited by the very genius of "common fame." Far from vindicating the acts of the General Assem-

bly, this Circular itself, coming forth in the name of the Assembly, is not the least considerable of the acts that need to be vindicated. Yet, strange to say, the drawing up of this document has been ascribed publicly and commonly, and, so far as we have heard, without contradiction, to that courteous, discreet, and venerable good man, Professor Miller, of Princeton. Dr. Miller owes it to his reputation for candor, and consistency, and gentlemanliness, and for some higher qualities, to disown, if he can, the authorship of this unfortunate epistle.

Having spoken thus freely of the merits of this letter, we will not decline the responsibility of justifying what we have spoken, by examining the letter itself in detail.

Beginning, then, with the first paragraph, we smile to see the General Assembly of 1837 not only announcing its exclusive right to address a letter to other ecclesiastical bodies, but professing itself, in the words of the Form of Government, "the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence, among all our churches." The bond of union!—when the one great aim of that "unusually long, interesting, and important session," had been disunion. The bond of peace!—when every debate, every speech, on one side at least, had breathed out "threatenings," if not "slaughter," and when the violence of contention, venting itself in words which would not have been tolerated in any secular assembly, had only stopped short of blows. The bond of mutual confidence! "Lo, what an entertaining sight, are brethren that agree!"

So soft a prelude is naturally followed by a touch of the pathetic and affectionate:

'We cannot consent to separate, after the unusually long, interesting, and important session which we are about to close, without pouring out the fullness of our hearts in reference to the weighty matters concerning which we have been called to act since we came together, into the ears and bosoms of all other christian churches, and especially those with which we are in friendly correspondence.'

How mellifluous the tone! How interesting the proposal! "Pouring out the fullness of our hearts!" The fullness of the hearts of Mr. Robert I. Breckinridge and of Dr. George Junkin, and the fullness of all the hearts that had filled with the fiery invectives of the one, and the muddy metaphysics of the other, is to be poured out into the ears and bosoms of all christian churches, through the silver trumpet of Dr. Miller. So much for exordium. We proceed to the first sentence of the second paragraph:

‘You cannot be ignorant, dear brethren, that for a number of years past, the friends of truth and of regular Presbyterian order in our beloved Zion, have been filled with painful apprehension at the manifest departure from our ecclesiastical standards, which appeared to be gaining ground in a number of our judicatories.’

“Other christian churches” are not ignorant, that for a number of years past, a certain party in the Presbyterian church has been filled with painful and growing apprehension at what they considered to be departures from the standards. But that this party has any right to arrogate to itself such a title as is here claimed for it, will not be admitted by other christian churches. Is not Dr. Richards as really a friend of truth and Presbyterian order as Dr. Miller? Are not Dr. Beecher and Dr. McAuley as really friends of truth and Presbyterian order as Dr. Wilson and Dr. Phillips? Will the christian world recognize R. I. Breckinridge as a more distinguished friend of truth and Presbyterian order than Albert Barnes? Shame on such arrogance! Some men profess to be the only friends of liberty: all others are regarded by them as pro-slavery, and in league with oppressors. The Perfectionists, while they had a being, claimed to be the only “friends of holiness:” all others were, in their estimation, the advocates of sin. Let Dr. Miller say, whether such a use of terms is not bad morals as well as bad logic and bad manners. Is there not, in the setting up of such a claim, whether by the editor of the *Liberator* or by the Perfectionists, something a little too much like falsehood to sit easy on any conscience not blinded by excitement. The writer of this letter and his party use, not only in this instance, but habitually, the same device. Let them say, if they can, whether the device, when used by them, has any more moral dignity than when used by men of inferior consideration.

‘We have thought ourselves called upon to make inquiry respecting the errors and disorders alledged to exist, and as far as possible to banish them from that portion of the professing family of Christ with which we are connected. You have witnessed for a number of successive years our struggles for the attainment of this object. You have witnessed the mortifying disappointments which, from time to time, have attended our efforts to obtain, by constitutional means, a redress of the grievances of which we complained.’

What has frustrated the efforts to banish, “by constitutional means,” the errors and disorders alledged to exist? First, the impossibility of proving, to the satisfaction of the General Assembly, when acting by the forms and under the solemnities of

a judicatory, the guilt of any individual formally charged with these alledged errors and disorders; and secondly, the fact, that if there are errors and disorders in the Presbyterian church, of such a character as to demand the exercise of discipline, the actual offenders have not been prosecuted, or, if prosecuted, have been effectually dealt with by inferior judicatories. The "last six years" have seen two prosecutions of Mr. Barnes and one of Dr. Beecher. At the first prosecution of Mr. Barnes, which was the indirect prosecution of 1831, Dr. Miller was chairman of a committee which was unanimous in reporting that the proceedings ought to be dropped; and he can testify, that the report was adopted by the Assembly with hardly a dissenting voice. In disposing of the second prosecution of Mr. Barnes, which came before the Assembly of 1836, by his appeal from the sentence of the Synod of Philadelphia, which had suspended him from the ministry, Dr. Miller and many of his party voted for restoring Mr. Barnes to the ministry in the Presbyterian church, on the ground, that his departures from the standards were not such as to disqualify him for exercising that ministry with a good conscience. In the case of Dr. Beecher, who had been twice acquitted in the lower judicatories, and who was brought to the Assembly of 1836 by the appeal of Dr. Wilson from the decision of the Synod of Cincinnati, the prosecutor found the Assembly so strongly and unitedly against him, and in favor of the alledged heretic, that he asked leave to withdraw his appeal, before it proceeded to trial. He took pains to declare, that he preferred that request, not because he was satisfied with Dr. Beecher's explanation, or reconciled to his theology, but only because of the importunity of the men of his own party. "When he came up here with his appeal," he said, "how had he been addressed by his friends and brethren? He had been assailed on all quarters with earnest requests, that he would withdraw the appeal. Not two, nor three, but dozens of those with whom he had been in the habit of acting, had pressed the request upon him; a request which, coming from such friends, he considered almost in the light of a command." Dr. Miller was active on that occasion, expressing his joy that the Assembly was about to be delivered from attending to this matter; and not a voice, among all the self-styled "friends of truth and order," was heard in opposition. Yet these are the men who now tell us about "the mortifying disappointments" which have attended their efforts to banish error and disorder "by constitutional means."

Why is it, that the only prosecutions which have been brought to the General Assembly, have been the prosecutions of these two men, who are among the most distinguished ornaments of the Presbyterian church, and whose fame belongs not to that church only, but to christendom? If there are in any of the presbyteries, preachers of heresy and workers of confusion, as very possibly there may be, they can be identified, and the proof of their heresy can be made out so clearly, that even Dr. Miller shall be constrained to vote for silencing them. It were a small matter, surely, for Dr. Junkin to go on a mission into New York or Ohio, and there to arrest some rampant ultraist in doctrine or in measures, and bring him to the bar of ecclesiastical justice. If the lower courts manifest a determination to screen offenders, there is a highway to the General Assembly. "Common fame" herself is weary with the stories which the panic-monger party have told her about Perfectionism and kindred extravagances in a certain region of New York. If these stories are true, why have not some of these fanatics, screened by the presbyteries, been brought bodily into the General Assembly? That there are no theological differences between the Yankee presbyteries of Western New York and the Scotch-Irish presbyteries of Western Pennsylvania, we do not alledge; but that the former are more disposed than the latter to tolerate Perfectionism, or any other material variation from the truth and order of the Presbyterian book, has not been proved. We happen to know, that in some instances men really heretical have been dealt with and disposed of by some of those defamed presbyteries, as promptly as the cumbrous machinery of Presbyterianism would permit. It is fair to presume, that the same thing has been done in other instances; and it may be conjectured, that this is one reason why the alledged obliquities of those presbyteries have not been rectified by the General Assembly. But whether this conjecture be admitted or rejected, the question remains—What efforts have these men made to cut off error and disorder, by bringing the actual individual heretics and disorganizers into the General Assembly for trial? This, we apprehend, is the only method known to the Presbyterian constitution, by which either heresy or confusion can be effectually put out of the church. Has this method been tried at all, except upon men whom Dr. Miller could not recognize as proved to be actual heretics or disorganizers? Yet they complain in a solemn appeal to the christian world, that nothing can be done "by constitutional means."

We proceed with the letter :

‘ You have seen what we regard as error becoming more extensive in its prevalence, and more bold and overbearing in its claims. You have seen certain voluntary societies, under the cover of professed zeal for the doctrines and order of our church, in fact if not in intention, gradually subverting both. You have heard the motives of the friends of truth reproached ; their name cast out as evil ; their zeal for maintaining the purity of the gospel represented as a mere struggle for power ; and all their attempts to detect and censure heresy, held up to public view as the efforts of restless and ambitious men to gain the pre-eminence for themselves.’

“ What we regard as error,” is a form of speech not wanting in courtesy. That what Dr. Miller and his party regard as error, is becoming continually “ more extensive in its prevalence,” we cannot question. We have so long been accustomed to hear the supposed errors of New England, and particularly New Haven and the *Christian Spectator*, spoken of as “ prevailing errors,” that we cannot but take it for granted, that their prevalence must be, by this time, very extensive. Whether the prevailing error grows “ more bold and overbearing in its claims,” is a point which we will not now discuss. Suffice it to say, that when men find their earnest and well-meant endeavors to promote the knowledge of divine truth opposed, not by argument only, but by denunciation, and not by denunciation only, but by conspiracy and extended combination, and yet in the face of such opposition prevailing, it will be very strange if they do not seem to their opposers to grow somewhat bold and overbearing.

“ You have seen certain voluntary societies, under cover of professed zeal for the doctrines and order of our church, in fact if not in intention, gradually subverting both.” Not to show to such as may not notice how the “ fullness” of the heart here breaks out, while the returning cautiousness of the pen only throws over it that feebly qualifying phrase, “ in fact if not in intention,”—which, by the awkwardness of its position, betrays its character as an after-thought interlined in the manuscript,—we ask, Have other churches seen any such thing as is here asserted ? They have seen the American Education Society and its branches greatly multiplying the number of Presbyterian candidates for the ministry. They have seen the Home Missionary Society and its auxiliaries aiding, with impartial hand, hundreds of Presbyterian congregations, in the effort to supply themselves with pastors holding their doctrines and their order. They have seen the American

Board of Foreign Missions, by the agency of Presbyterian missionaries, forming Presbyterian churches among the Aborigines, under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the General Assembly. But as for any subversion of the Presbyterian doctrines and order, by these benevolent associations, either in fact or in design, other churches have seen no such thing.

That which follows, touching "the motives of the friends of truth reproached, their name cast out as evil," etc., might seem pathetic, if we did not remember, that it proceeds from the party which recognizes among its champions such orators as Mr. McCalla and Mr. R. I. Breckinridge, and such writers as the editors of the *Presbyterian* and the *Southern Herald*. But when regarded as proceeding from such a party—a party not often equaled in the imputation of unchristian motives and the use of abusive epithets—the appeal to pity becomes ludicrous. The abuse which that party has heaped upon Absalom Peters alone, ought to make them ashamed to utter such a complaint.

After a short description of some of the effects of party spirit on the interests of religion in the Presbyterian church, the letter proceeds:

'Such has been our melancholy history, especially for the last six years; and such were the discouraging and distressing circumstances in which this Assembly convened. On coming together, it was found to contain such a decided majority of the friends of truth and order, as to place within our reach the most thorough measures of reform. And it is worthy of special notice, that this majority was created and brought together in full view of the measures adopted by the orthodox Assembly of 1835, and of all the conflicts and painful disclosures which characterized the Assembly of 1836. It was after the attention of the whole church had been strongly called to these measures and disclosures, that our presbyteries sent a delegation, the major part of whom declared in favor of the doctrines and order of our body. We felt ourselves, therefore, distinctly and solemnly called upon, by the voice of the church, to go forward and rescue her struggling and bleeding interests from that humiliating and degrading perversion to which they had been so long exposed.'

Here notice the reiterated description of the party in whose behalf the letter is written, as "the friends of truth and order," with the insinuation involved more distinctly than before, that the minority in the late Assembly were friends of error and disorder. Akin to this, is the use of the word "orthodox," as characterizing the Assembly of 1835, implying, of course,

that at least some other Assemblies within the last six years were heretical.

Nor will the reader, acquainted with facts, fail to notice the solemn statement, that an "old side" majority of six or eight, in an assembly of two hundred and fifty members, was to be regarded as a distinct expression of the will of the church, that "the most thorough measures of reform" should be adopted. Was this the actual reason for driving those "thorough measures" through the Assembly with such fiery haste? Was not the opposite reason felt—nay, avowed by the party at the time, namely, that Providence had given them the majority this year, and that they could not safely calculate on having a majority next year?

Proceeding, by an easy transition, to the actual doings of the majority in the Assembly, the letter touches first on the great subject of those doctrinal errors which, it affirms, "there was but too much evidence had gained an alarming prevalence in some of our judicatories." Of these errors it is said:

'You will see, by our published acts, that some of them affect the very foundation of the system of gospel truth, and that they all bear relations to the gospel plan, of very serious and ominous import. Surely, doctrines which go to the formal or virtual denial of our covenant relation to Adam; the native and total depravity of man; the entire inability of the sinner to recover himself from rebellion and corruption; the nature and source of regeneration; and our justification solely on account of the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, cannot, upon any just principle, be regarded as "minor errors." They form, in fact, "another gospel;" and it is impossible for those who faithfully adhere to our public standards, to walk with those who adopt such opinions with either comfort or confidence.'

We turn to the "published acts" of the Assembly to find the more detailed description of this "other gospel." We find on the printed minutes (pp. 468, 469) the testimony of the General Assembly against sixteen alledged errors which had been reported by the preparatory party convention as widely diffused in the Presbyterian church, and which the convention declared had been "reduced into form and openly embraced by almost entire presbyteries and synods, favored by repeated acts of successive General Assemblies, and at last virtually sanctioned to an alarming extent by the numerous Assembly of 1836." It would be an affectation of humility on our part to suppose, that the party in the specification of errors to be testified against, did not intend to describe and condemn the errors which, according to "common fame," seem to be the

most threatening of all prevailing errors, namely, the errors of the New Haven school. Indeed, we have heard it rumored, that in forming their specifications of error, they had help from New England, and that some of Mr. Plumer's high authorities in that quarter contributed of the resources of their wisdom and candor to the completeness of the intended testimony against that incorrigible New Haven divinity, which, as yet, neither the manliness of discussion, nor the meanness of itinerant tale-gathering and tale-bearing, nor the diplomacy of correspondence and coalition, nor the *coup de grace* of Dr. Tyler's letters to Dr. Witherspoon, has been able to demolish. However that may be, we cannot err widely in treating these alledged errors as if they were imputed to New Haven; and we are sure, that most of the so called "friends of truth" think ill enough of us, and well enough of human nature, to believe, that if the errors are not held here, they are not held anywhere.

We take this occasion, therefore, to propose a few observations and inquiries touching the sixteen propositions testified against, on the printed minutes of the late General Assembly—propositions respecting which this solemn epistle affirms, that they "had gained an alarming prevalence" in some Presbyterian judicatories, and that "they form, in fact, another gospel" from that of the standards. That the reader may see distinctly what the errors are, which, having been declared by the convention to have gained so great a prevalence, were condemned by the expurgated Assembly as destructive heresies, we place the whole series on our pages, and to each proposition, separately, we append our testimony.

'Error 1. That God would have prevented the existence of sin in our world, but was not able without destroying the moral agency of man; or, that for aught that appears in the bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.'

In respect to this "Error," we offer the following considerations:

1. "That God would have prevented the existence of sin in our world, but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man," is not taught or believed by anybody within our knowledge. The discussions of the *Christian Spectator* on this subject have respected the introduction of sin into the universe. There may be worlds which God, without impairing the moral agency of their inhabitants, has guarded effectually against the introduction of moral evil, and where

sin has never been known, save in the report of its mischiefs and penalties, and of the mysteries of redemption from its power and curse, as manifested in the history of this world, of heaven, and of hell.

2. It is not yet heresy, we believe, to affirm, that there is sin in the universe, and that all the sin which does exist is infinitely hateful to the Divine mind—evil and only evil. In some sense, then, the existence of sin in the universe is contrary to the will of God—odious and abominable in his sight. In some sense, he *willed*—or, to spell the same word in another way, he *would*—that sin should not exist: that is, he “would have prevented its existence, but” that there was some necessity for permitting it. Where then was that necessity? In the nature of sin, as a necessary instrument for God to work with, or a necessary object for God to work upon, so that sin, if not good in itself, is good in its relations? Or, in the nature of a government of law over intelligent agents, extending through the worlds of infinite space, and the ages of infinite duration?

This consideration may be stated in another form. If sin is really odious to God, and contrary to his will, then he would have prevented all the sin which actually exists in the universe, “but was not able, without” contradicting in some respect his own wise and benevolent plan of creation and government. In other words, he permitted the evil which actually exists, rather than permit some greater evil which would otherwise have existed. But what is that evil which would have been greater than the sin which actually darkens and deforms the fair universe of God? If all those intelligent creatures who have rebelled against God, had remained through eternity perfectly holy, and if none others had sinned among those whom the administration of God’s moral government has actually kept from sinning, would that holiness have been, either in itself or in its tendencies, the greater evil, which to prevent, God has permitted the existence of sin? The mind of every “friend of truth and order” in the universe must revolt from such a thought. What then is that greater evil, which God could prevent only by permitting the apostasy of certain angels and of all mankind? Shall we say, that by permitting that amount of moral evil which actually exists, God has prevented other sin—some wider and more ruinous apostasy? True; but the question is, Why did the Creator permit sin at all? The question remains, When God formed the system of the universe, what was that evil—greater than all actual sin, past, present, and to come—which would have

existed, if God had exerted his physical omnipotence for the prevention of all sin? Who can say, that such an exertion of omnipotence would not have been inconsistent with the existence of that system of moral government, the administration of which is the blessedness of God, and the results of which are to be, through eternity, the highest blessedness of the universe? And if any theologian, or preacher, in attempting "to justify the ways of God to men," and to solve the doubts which, in spite of all decretals and canons, will arise in thinking minds, respecting the existence of evil under the government of God—doubts out of which grow, so far as intellect is concerned, all atheism, all fatalism, all denial of responsibility and future retribution—shall assume it as the basis of his *theodicea*, that sin may, in respect to divine prevention, be incidental to a government by law over a universe of moral beings—shall he be denounced as having embraced another gospel?

3. How shall the opposite doctrine be stated? Shall we say, that God did not merely permit sin, as incidental to the best system of the universe, but positively introduced it, as a constituent part of the system—one of the elements which make it "very good." Shall we say, as is said in a pamphlet ascribed to Dr. Harvey, that the true doctrine on this subject "does not contemplate sin as on the whole, or in respect to the operations of the divine government, an evil"—that sin "is no deduction from the sum of the greatest good"—that "*it is an evil only in the limited views and experience of finite beings*?"* Shall we say, with the Universalists, that every actual instance of sin, though to the limited and darkened view of the sinner it seems evil, is really good, better in its tendencies, more desirable in the sight of God, more "calculated" to promote the happiness of the universe, than holiness would be in its place? Or shall we be condemned to adopt such self-annihilating propositions as Dr. Tyler has put forth, in announcing the latest edition of his doctrine on this subject? Shall we say, with him, that God "permitted sin, because he saw that he could so overrule it and counteract its tendencies, as to render it conducive to the highest good of the universe?"† Permit sin, *because* it must be overruled and its tendencies counteracted, in order to secure the greatest good! Call this an answer to the question, why God has not secured the greatest good, without permitting the introduction of that

* Examination of a Review of Dr. Taylor's Sermon, &c., p. 51.

† Letters on the Origin and Progress of the New Haven Theology, p. 131.

which, being evil in itself, and in all its tendencies, can exist only to be counteracted!

4. If the General Assembly, at its next session, will cause the second chapter of the fifth book of Chalmers on Natural Theology to be read in the hearing of all its members, they may find in it much matter for profitable meditation and serious inquiry. They will find there a theologian not of New England, but of Presbyterian Scotland, the very head of existing Scottish orthodoxy, the Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, expounding with great admiration the hypothesis, that the sin existing in the universe may be that which, in respect to Divine prevention, is incidental to the best possible system.* Has Dr. Chalmers embraced another gospel? Have "the errors of the New Haven school" found a lodgment in the theological chair of the first university of Scotland; and are they there recommended and enforced by the eloquence and fascinating genius of the great ornament of the Scottish pulpit?

But we proceed with the Assembly's catalogue of errors:

'Error 2. That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.'

1. That God's purpose of election is founded on the foreknowledge of something, is a matter not of metaphysics, but of direct scriptural testimony. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God." "Whom he foreknew, them he did predestinate."

2. That the elect are chosen not *on account of* foreseen faith and good works, but *to* faith and holiness, is also testified in the scriptures. "Elect . . . to obedience through sanctification of the Spirit." "Them he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." If any Presbyterian ministers are ignorant of this, let them be taught the way of God more perfectly.

3. It is not a very violent hypothesis to suppose, that the something upon the foreknowledge of which God's purpose of election is founded, may be the appropriateness of those acts of his providence and grace by which the conversion and sanctification of certain individuals is actually brought to pass. Will the writer and endorsers of this Letter tell us, that such a theological opinion is "another gospel?"

* See, especially, Sec. 7—15.

4. The Arminians, and the cavilers with whom we in New England have to do, habitually represent the Calvinistic doctrine of election as teaching, that all those to whom there is any chance of being saved, must infallibly be saved, let them do what they will. Is it the intention of the General Assembly to authenticate that caricature of Calvinism as correct, and to forbid us to say, that election to eternal life is founded on, or involves a previous election to faith and obedience? The supposition is not to be admitted.

‘*Error 3.* That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with the sins of any other parent.’

1. We did not commit the first sin of Adam. In reference to that individual deed, we may say to “the accusing spirit,”—every one of us—“Thou canst not say, I *did* it.” In this sense, we have no more *to do* with that sin, than with the sins of any other parent; that is, we are no more the *doers* of that sin, than of the sins of other parents. But this is not the meaning of the proposition.

2. We are not bound to *undo* the first sin of Adam, nor called to repent of it; nor are we to be judged for it. In this sense, too, the alledged error is no error. Nor is the proposition condemned in this sense.

3. We are subject to certain consequences of the first sin of Adam, which do not result to us from the sins of any other parent. That first sin “brought death into the world and all our wo,”—involved us all not only in numberless calamities and pains, but in sin, and the voluntary corruption of our whole nature, and thus brought us under the condemning sentence of God’s law. Who it is among Presbyterians or Congregationalists, that denies this, we know not. If there are any such, call them Pelagians.

‘*Error 4.* That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam, when he was created.’

1. John Locke has been regarded as having proved, that there are no innate ideas. Many theologians, within the last hundred years, have endeavored so to exhibit the doctrine of depravity by nature, as not to contradict this point of science. Can there be responsible action, where there are no ideas? or moral character, where there is no possibility of responsible action? or “moral defilement,” where there is no moral character?

2. The twin children whom Rebecca bare to Isaac, are spoken of in the scriptures as "not having done," at a certain time before they were born, "any good or evil." Metaphysically, they may have been already in the world at the period referred to. Popularly, they were yet to come into the world. If the General Assembly considers coming into the world as an event in the history of an infant anterior to its birth, then they seem to testify against Paul, as "holding another gospel." If they consider coming into the world as synonymous or coincident with being born, then it would be interesting to be informed at what point between the period referred to by the apostle and the first inhalation, all sound Presbyterians are to believe, that those twins contracted moral defilement.

3. The comparison between infants and Adam, is instituted only *ad captandum*. Adam's freedom from moral defilement "when he was created," is commonly, and in popular discourse not incorrectly, understood as including that moral rectitude which characterized his original disposition towards the objects of moral affection. "Adam when he was created," is naturally understood to mean, "Adam in his original estate of holiness." The statement therefore *seems* to have been framed with a design to make people believe, that the "new school men," so called, in the Presbyterian church, and all New England, save the East Windsor men, hold the undoubtedly Pelagian dogma, that the original moral character of Adam and that of all his descendants is the same. If such was the design of the framers of the statement, it was a design involving what we understand by "moral defilement."

'Error 5. That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God in this world as brute animals, and that their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.'

1. "That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God in this world as brute animals," is a doctrine which has often been slanderously charged upon us. We trust, that to charge it on our brethren in the Presbyterian church is equally a calumny. Believe that an infant of the human race, a being of a rational nature, created in God's image, entering on the career of immortal existence, sustains no other relation to the moral government of God than a brute animal! God forbid!

2. How do Dr. Miller's "friends of truth" account for the sufferings and death of infants? Do they not regard it as a

"penal" infliction on account of Adam's first transgression? And in what other way do they account for the sufferings and death of brutes? Do they not justify the misery of all irrational animals by ascribing it to the fall of man, regarding it as part of the penalty of the great apostasy? If not, they are at odds with Calvin. He argues from the sufferings of brute animals, as included in the penalty of Adam's sin, to the sufferings of all human nature as proceeding from the same cause. His words are, "*Nec mirum si genus suum pessumdedit suâ defectione, qui totum naturæ ordinem pervertit in coelo et terra. Ingemiscunt omnes creaturæ, inquit Paulus, corruptioni obnoxia, non volentes. Si causa quæritur, non dubium est quin partem sustineant ejus pænæ quam promeritus est homo, in cujus usum conditæ fuerant.*"* We are aware, that there is a class of New England divines who regard the sufferings and death of infants at and from the moment of birth, if not before, as the penalty of their actual transgressions; and who regard us as heretics, because they imagine, that we do not assent to this deviation from ancient Calvinism. Was not the statement we are now considering, framed in New England by some of that class of divines? And did not the Convention, and after them the majority of the Assembly, impelled by their hot haste to testify against "prevailing" errors, and confiding too implicitly in their New England counselors, adopt the statement into their catalogue of errors, without perceiving, that in so doing they condemned an opinion of their own?

3. "Penal," as we understand language, is the same with "punitive," "inflicted in the course of justice on offenders." It does not accord with our ideas of justice, to inflict punishment, in any proper sense of the word, upon any other person than the perpetrator of the crime to be punished. The misery in which the sinner involves others is the consequence of his sin, not its punishment. Evil inflicted for personal demerit, is different from evil which comes in any other way, and ought to bear a different name. We say, therefore, notwithstanding the authority of Calvin and the testimony of the General Assembly, that the sufferings and death of brute animals, and the sufferings and death of such human beings as have "not done any good or evil," are not *penal*, in any proper use of the word. He who suffers "penal" inflictions is treated as a subject of retribution; and we are happy to agree, on this point, with Dr.

* Inst. Lib. II., Cap. i., Sec. 5.

Woods, who affirms, in the most formal manner, "that there is no such thing as a moral being who is treated as a subject of retribution while his moral nature is not in any way developed in holy or unholy action."*

'Error 6. That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture, that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.'

1. If by "original sin" be meant concreated sin—sin of which not the soul itself, but the soul's Creator, is the author—then we believe in no such thing. If by "original sin" be meant the ground of the certainty, that the first acts of the soul, and all its acts till renewed by grace, will be sinful; then we admit the thing, with a protest against the perversion of the word *sin* to signify that which is not itself transgression, but only *the ground of the certainty of transgression*. But if by original sin be meant, that "corruption of his whole nature," which, in consequence of the apostasy of our first parents, is the original moral character of every man, just as holiness was the original moral character of Adam, then we hold the doctrine, and we doubt not, that all those brethren in the Presbyterian church who suffer the imputation of our supposed errors, hold it with us. In this sense, original sin does "include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering."

2. "By nature innocent!" New Haven theology is, that men are "by nature sinners," "by nature children of wrath." See Taylor's *Concio ad Clerum*, and all the other books and publications in which the New Haven theology, so called, is authentically exhibited.

3. That infants "not having done any good or evil," yet dying at that period of their existence, enter into eternal perdition, let those affirm who dare to inflict such violence on their own moral sense and the moral sense of all mankind.† That as belonging to a ruined race for whom Christ died, they are saved through the blood of the Redeemer, and sanctified by the communication of the Holy Spirit, let those deny

* Essay on Native Depravity, p. 187.

† See Woods on Native Depravity, p. 190.

who are presumptuous enough to pretend to an acquaintance with mysteries which God has not revealed.

‘*Error 7.* That the doctrine of imputation, whether of the guilt of Adam’s sin, or Christ’s righteousness, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.’

1. What do Dr. Woods and the East Windsor divines say to this? Have they given in their adhesion to the theory of imputation? Or do they reply to their brethren of the South—So saying, ye condemn us also? No new views in respect to imputation have been broached of late in New England. On this point all parties here have been supposed to agree.

2. What do the authors of this testimony mean by the imputation of Adam’s sin to his posterity? Do they mean, that Adam’s first act of transgression was strictly and properly the act of his descendants? This the Biblical Repertory denies.* Do they mean, that the act of Adam, or his ill-desert, is transferred to his descendants? This also the Biblical Repertory denies.† Do they only mean, that the descendants of Adam, without sharing in the act or the criminality, are, under the divine constitution of things, held subject to the consequences of his first transgression; so that “all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation,” have by nature the same moral character which he formed by his apostasy, and are under the same condemnation? In this proposition, Princeton, Auburn, Lane, Andover, Yale, and even East Windsor, can agree.

‘*Error 8.* That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.’

1. That the sufferings and death of Christ were truly vicarious, in other words, that they were a substitute for the execution of the penalty of the law upon the guilty, is a proposition which we believe no man in the Presbyterian church, and no man claiming a place among the orthodox in New England, has ever denied. That Christ’s sufferings and death were “truly penal”—were inflicted by strict and literal justice—were literally the penalty of the law of God—cannot be affirmed, without affirming, that Christ was guilty of the sins for which he suffered, and that, as guilty, he suffered all that is included in eternal death.

2. The use of the word “symbolical,” in reference to this subject, is confined to one man. The word “instructive” may

* Bib. Rep. for 1830, p. 90. † Ibid.

indeed seem to have been inserted for the purpose of creating an association of ideas which might make indiscriminating readers feel as if there were some affinity between the views of atonement here aimed at, and the Unitarian views; but we would rather believe, that those who framed the statement had no other design than to describe, simply and fairly, the views of atonement commonly held by New England theologians. In the New England schools and churches, the common if not universal mode of explaining and defending the doctrine of the Atonement, is that of Dwight, Hopkins, West, and the younger Edwards. According to their view, the sacrifice of Christ is a provision which God has made in the administration of his moral government, and by which the ends of that government are secured consistently with the pardon of sin, as perfectly as if the sin pardoned had been punished to the full extent of its demerit; the whole design of the Atonement being, not an effect to be produced on the mind and disposition of God, as if he had a certain thirst for misery, which, when once excited by the sight of sin, must be sated somewhere; but an effect in the support of law, to be produced on the subjects of his empire, that the principalities and powers of heaven and hell, as well as the inhabitants of earth, might know and fear the majestic holiness of their King. The contrary view proceeds, throughout, on the idea of a simple substitution of persons—Christ becoming a sinner, and punished as such, instead of the elect; and the elect becoming innocent, and treated as such, with strict distributive justice, instead of Christ. This view, we suppose, is here referred to, when the sufferings and death of Christ are spoken of as “truly vicarious and penal,” and the other view we suppose to be aimed at when the Atonement is spoken of as “symbolical, governmental, and instructive” only. Are we right here? If we are wrong, will some of the New England allies and defenders of the majority in the late Assembly set us right?

‘*Error 9.* That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.’

1. Was the first man, before his fall, “by nature, and independently of the almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God?” Is any angel? The language in these questions must of course be understood as the

authors of this testimony understand the same language in their statement. If we should affirm, that Adam, before his first transgression, was "by nature, and independently of the almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to obey all the commands of God," would not Dr. Miller and his "friends of truth" testify against the proposition as heretical?

2. That the sinner is any *less* dependent on God than Adam was, no man has ever affirmed. Adam, as a creature, was dependent on him in whom all creatures live, and move, and have their being. For the existence of those faculties and capacities, which were the constituent elements of his nature as an intelligent and moral agent—for his senses, his reason, his constitutional susceptibilities, his power of choice, he was dependent on him who upholdeth all things by the word of his power. The providence of God compassed him about with objects of knowledge, of emotion, and of choice; and in this respect also he was dependent. All this was his dependence as a creature. Did his dependence go beyond this? Was it necessary for God, besides giving existence to the constituent powers of his nature, and besides giving him the objective grounds of the action of those powers, to do something more, in order to constitute ability for such action? With the power of knowing, and the object of knowledge, was Adam in possession of ability to know? or was it necessary for God to do something else, in order to Adam's act of knowing? With all the powers and conditions of moral action, and with the law enacted and sanctioned to secure right action, was he in possession of all the ability necessary to a compliance with God's commands? Besides being dependent for the faculty, and the object, and the revealed rule, was he dependent for the act, or if not for the act, for something else between the power and the action of the power? If one man answers affirmatively, and another negatively, on this point of transcendental metaphysics, shall he who answers Yes, presume to deliver unto Satan him who answers No?

3. Is fallen man in any respect *more* dependent on God than Adam was? We hold the affirmative of this question. Who holds the negative? If there were any such in the General Assembly, we doubt not, that they voted with the majority. Is it orthodox to hold, that the only dependence of the impenitent sinner on the almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, is his dependence as a creature on the Creator?

4. What then is the ground or occasion of that dependence

on the Holy Sprit, which is peculiar to fallen man? Adam was dependent, as a creature, on the power of God. So are all other creatures. But apostate man is not only dependent, as *a creature*, on the author of existence, but also dependent, as *a sinner*, on the Holy Spirit. It is his apostasy, his being a sinner, which constitutes this dependence. It is not, that he has lost any faculty or part of his nature, but, that he is "wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts," and *thereby* "indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." It is not, that the will itself, the faculty of action, is annihilated, or paralyzed, or (as Coleridge has it) "weakened," or (any more than at its first creation) "subject to the law of cause and effect;" for, on the contrary, "God hath endowed the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined, to good *or* evil." It is only that man, by falling, "hath wholly lost all ABILITY OF WILL"—that is, his *will* has become fixedly disinclined or averse—"to any spiritual good."* Thus, as a sinner, he is dependent, not for power, or any subjective qualification, but for a divine influence which shall secure the right use of qualifications already possessed.

If the dependence of the sinner is anything more than this, what can that *more* be? Are we told, that he is dependent on God for power, sensibility, illumination, or some other subjective quality requisite to right action? But was not Adam, in his innocence, as truly dependent for power, for sensibility, for illumination, for that something else, as any of his fallen race? And are we not now speaking of a dependence peculiar to man as a sinner?

5. There is, then, what is called an inability of the sinner to comply with God's commands; and it consists in the sinner's fixedness of will to do evil. 'This it is, that, notwithstanding all the offers and promises of the word, will destroy him eternally, unless the Spirit of God shall work in him to will and to do. This inability is his sinfulness, not his weakness—his crime, not his calamity. The removal of this inability is not "*necessary* to his compliance with the commands of God;" it *is* his compliance with those commands. If there is any other inability, God's commandments have no relation to it, and its removal is not necessary to obedience; for, by the letter of God's first and supreme command, the ability of the subject is the expressly defined measure of the claim. "Thou shalt love the

* Conf. of Faith, Ch. VI., Sec. 2, 4: Ch. IX., Sec. 1, 3.

Lord thy God," not with faculties which thou hast not, nor with capacities beyond thy nature, but "with all *thy* heart, and with all *thy* soul, and with all *thy* strength, and with all *thy* mind." So true are the principles of God's revelation to that instinctive sense of right which is his voice within us.

6. We dare to affirm, then, with the long-received theology of New England, though a hundred General Assemblies pronounce it heretical, that man has by his nature, as a responsible agent, and independently of the aids of grace, all the ability "NECESSARY TO" obedience. For to say, that because sinful man has not that obedient will which is the identical and only thing required, therefore he has not the ability "necessary to" obedience, is to darken God's counsel; for it confounds the ability necessary to an act, with the act itself, by making the ability to do and the act of doing the same thing.

'Error 10. That Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.'

'Error 11. That saving faith is not an effect of the special operation of the Holy Spirit, but a mere rational belief of the truth, or assent to the word of God.'

We desire to be informed from what infected district, propositions so marvelous as these two, were reported to the Convention. For our part, we not only never heard them professed, but never, in all our acquaintance with common fame, heard them ascribed to any Presbyterian or Congregationalist.

'Error 12. That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself; and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work.'

1. What regeneration is, according to the Presbyterian standards, we cannot say, for the standards nowhere define it; and this particular word, we believe, does not occur either in the Confession or in the Catechisms. If the word is understood as synonymous with "effectual calling," then to say, that it is the act of the sinner himself, is to speak nonsense as well as heresy. If the word is understood as including justification, adoption, and all the new relations consequent upon effectual calling—which is Baxter's view—then none will be guilty of teaching, that it is the sinner's own act. But if it is used, as in the theological writings of New England it is commonly

used, to designate, simply, that moral change in the mind of the sinner, which is the first result of effectual calling, then it is in all respects good orthodoxy to say, that the change called regeneration is an act of the sinner. Effectual calling is God's act; but the first result of it on the mind of the subject, or what the standards speak of as the "answer" to the call, is the sinner's act, for he "comes most freely, being made willing."

2. A "change of the governing purpose" seems a very slight thing to some minds. Yet that phraseology, strictly construed, has the same meaning with the phraseology of the Confession of Faith on the same subject. The "governing purpose" of the sinner is nothing else than the controlling inclination of his will; that determination of the will intrinsically free, by which he is "altogether averse from that which is good;" that moral character by which he is "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." The moral change which is the first result of effectual calling, is, according to the Confession, "the determining of the will to that which is good."

3. Taking the word regeneration still in the same sense, to say, that this moral change is "produced" by the sinner himself, is, at the best, equivocal; for though the change is essentially and necessarily the sinner's own act—it being impossible that a change of will should be other than an act of will, unless the faculty itself is changed—yet when the change is spoken of by this particular name, it is commonly understood as spoken of with at least an implied reference to the power of the Holy Spirit employed in bringing it to pass.

4. Whoever it is, that denies the "direct influence of the Holy Spirit" in regeneration, we are not guilty of holding or teaching that denial. Often, indeed, we have said, that regeneration is by the truth, and of course by "a persuasive exhibition" of it to the mind; but as often have we insisted, not only that the direct influence of the Spirit is that without which regeneration never takes place, but also, that it is distinct from the influence of the truth. That there is an "analogy" between the influence by which God changes the sinner's heart, and "the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another," let the General Assembly deny if they please. In so doing, they will contradict at once their standards and the bible. For not only does the bible speak expressly of God's drawing "with cords of a man," but the influence by which God converts men is described and named

almost uniformly, both in "the book" and in the bible, by terms borrowed from "the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another,"—terms which can have no significance, unless some analogy be recognized between these two kinds of influence.

5. He who charges New England theology in general, or New Haven theology in particular, or any other theology in fellowship with us, with denying, that regeneration is "instantaneous"—taking place at an indivisible moment—bears false witness against his neighbor.

'Error 13. That God has done all that *he can do* for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest.'

1. Is there not a sense in which it may be said, without any abuse of language, that God has done all that he can do for the salvation of all men? Is it not true, that he has done all that his power, directed by his wisdom and holiness, can do to that end? In reference to the whole world, might he not appeal to the intelligent universe, "Judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard: what could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it?" Is it not true, that God will have (θέλει) all men to be saved, and is "not willing (μὴ βουλόμενός) that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance?" Is that solemn abjuration, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live," empty of all meaning?

2. To affirm the proposition in any other sense, is to be guilty of an extravagance hardly on this side of insanity. To understand it as asserted in any other sense, without the most constraining reasons for so understanding it, is either folly or malice.

'Error 14. That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner, without impairing their moral agency.'

If the Assembly had condemned the proposition, that God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as to make them choose or act in a particular manner, *leaving them no power to the contrary choice or action*, without impairing their moral agency, we would willingly have attempted the defense of that proposition against their authority. But the proposition here condemned, no rational being will defend or acknowledge as his own.

‘*Error 15.* That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner’s acceptance with God ; and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.’

With all our hearts we subscribe to the condemnation of this error, not only as an error, but as an error striking deep into the gospel. Christ is our righteousness, the only ground of our acceptance with God.

‘*Error 16.* That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the gospel is, that they make themselves to differ.’

The same verbal proposition is often true in one aspect, and false in another. If it is true, that they who are heirs of eternal life, “come most freely” to Christ ; if it is true, that they “purify their souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit ;” if it is true, that unbelieving men do always freely resist the influences that truly tend to their salvation, and “will not come” to Christ for life ; then it is true, in a momentous sense, that they make themselves to differ—true, in a sense that will give to eternal despair its keenest bitterness. Yet it is true, in another aspect, that God makes them to differ—true, in a sense that will fill the souls of the redeemed with praise unutterable forever.

In taking leave of the sixteen propositions thus catalogued and condemned by the General Assembly as heresies widely prevalent among the churches under their care, we cannot but glance at the document as a whole, to see if there are any traces of the intent with which it was drawn up. Here is a rude caricature of some of those doctrines about which there has been recent controversy among brethren in New England ; here is a statement of the settled doctrines of New England respecting imputation, atonement, and natural ability ; here are certain strange errors, so incredible, that it is almost as easy to believe the errors themselves, as to believe, that anybody out of Bedlam holds them for truths : and all these propositions are condemned in a mass, as another gospel, which, in the words of this solemn appeal to the christian world, has “gained an alarming prevalence in some of our judicatories.” What was the intention ? Was it simply to bear a testimony against New Haven ? Or was it to testify against New England at large, and against that half of the Presbyterian church which, having come out of New England, has not ceased to revere the names of Edwards, Smalley, Bellamy, and Dwight ? And was not only the caricature of what are called New Haven opinions, but every extravagance which party jealousy has re-

ported as having been broached by erratic individuals, added in, to make the whole more scandalous? Far be it from us to impute such a design to the framers of this testimony. Perhaps, however, something like this was the design of that great Accuser who has got the advantage of them by his devices, and who gave some painful evidences of his presence in that assembly of the sons of God.

There is one circumstance in regard to these alledged errors, which seems to have given great offense to the authors of this testimony. It is the remarkable circumstance, that not a man can be found in the Presbyterian church, who does not protest against having this catalogue of opinions imputed to him as any part of the confession of his faith; and that all parties strenuously profess to receive the Presbyterian Confession "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." This, instead of occasioning hesitation on the part of the majority, or leading them to suspect, that there might be some misinformation or misapprehension in the case, was only an aggravation of the guilt of the minority. Those on the side opposite to the Convention not being "friends of truth and order," what right had they to believe the Confession of Faith, or to state their own opinions? Did not the Doctors of the Convention know better than they, as to what they believed and what they did not believe?

Of this the "Circular Letter," to which we now return, speaks as follows:

'It cannot be denied, indeed, that those who adopted and preached these opinions, at the same time declared their readiness to subscribe our Confession of Faith, and actually professed their assent to it, in the usual form, without apparent scruple. This, in fact, was one of the most revolting and alarming characteristics of their position. They declared, that in doing this, they only adopted the confession "*for substance*," and by no means intended to receive the whole system which it contained. Upon this principle, we had good evidence, that a number of Presbyteries, in the ordination and reception of ministers and other church officers, avowedly and habitually acted. And hence it has not been uncommon for the members of such Presbyteries publicly and formally to repudiate some of the important doctrines of the formulary which they had thus subscribed; and even, in a few extraordinary cases, to hold up the system of truth which it contains as "an abomination;" as a system which it were to be "wished had never had an existence." No wonder, that men feeling and acting thus should have been found, in some instances, substituting entirely different Confessions of Faith in place of that which is contained in our constitution. Who can doubt, that such a method of subscribing to articles of faith is immoral in prin-

ciple; that it is adapted to defeat the great purpose of adopting confessions; and that, if persisted in, it could not fail to open the door of our church wider and wider to the introduction of the most radical and pestiferous heresies, which would speedily destroy her character as an evangelical body.'

Without stopping to discuss at length the grave question so peremptorily settled in this paragraph, we venture to propose two inquiries. There is, as every one knows, a strict mode and a liberal mode of receiving a confession of faith. One way is, to receive it not only as the truth, but as the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in respect to the matters of which it treats. The other way is, to receive it as a whole, "as containing a system," "for substance." The grave question is, In which of these ways are the ministers and officers of the Presbyterian church constitutionally and conscientiously bound to receive that confession of faith? None others, it will be remembered, are required to assent to it at all.

The first inquiry which the peremptoriness of the above quoted paragraph moves us to propose, is, What is the reason of the difference between the form of assent to the confession prescribed by the Presbyterian church in the United States, and the form of assent prescribed in the Kirk of Scotland? The confession, the constitution, the forms and usages generally, of the former, are borrowed, with slight deviations, from the latter. But in respect to the form of assent to the standards, there is a striking difference. To show this difference, we place the two forms side by side:

Scotch Form.

"Do you sincerely own and believe *the whole doctrine* of the Confession, &c., to be founded on the word of God? And do you acknowledge the same as the confession of your faith; and will you firmly and constantly adhere thereto, and to the utmost of your power assert, maintain, and defend the same? &c. Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Bouregnian, and other doctrines, and tenets, and opinions whatsoever, contrary to and inconsistent with the foresaid Confession of Faith?"

American Form.

"Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this church, as containing the *system* of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

Why is this studied departure from the model? Who can

explain it but by admitting, that the founders of the American Presbyterian church, being most of them of the Puritan stock, and holding New England principles in regard to such matters, intended to have more freedom of opinion, more theological discussion, more toleration of subordinate differences, than is consistent with an honest use of the Scotch formula?

Our second inquiry is, Can any man reconcile the position taken in the paragraph before us, with the conduct of Dr. Miller in twice acquitting Mr. Barnes, or with the part he had in Dr. Beecher's triumph? In regard to Mr. Barnes, after voting to sustain his appeal and to restore him to his standing as a minister of the Presbyterian church, and thus declaring more solemnly than words could declare, that Mr. Barnes' opinions were consistent with a constitutional assent to the Confession of Faith, he affirmed with equal solemnity, and moved the Assembly to affirm, that Mr. Barnes held "opinions materially at variance with the Confession." Is it true, that a man holding "opinions materially at variance with the Confession of Faith," may be constitutionally a minister in the Presbyterian church? And is it also true, that the constitution requires every minister in that church to adopt the Confession as right in every jot and tittle?

But the meaning of the form of assent to the Confession being adjusted, and all that is claimed on that subject in this paragraph being conceded, the Confession itself must be interpreted; and can there be no honest difference of opinion as to its meaning? The Westminster Confession of Faith is a voluminous document, one hundred and ninety years old, touching upon the abstrusest matters of which the human mind can take cognizance, framed by men whose systems of philosophy have in no small measure passed away and become matters of historical investigation, the work not of one or two, but of a numerous assembly, in which many diverse shades of opinion must needs be compromised. In the name of all human experience, then, we ask, Is it the peculiar good fortune of this Westminster Confession, not only to be infallibly true, but to be infallibly understood? If not, how can the authors of this Letter be assured, that all who seem to differ from their understanding of the Confession, differ of course and equally from the Confession itself? Is not every candidate for ordination to judge for himself, under his accountability to God and to those who watch over him in the church? Are not the members of every ordaining presbytery to judge for themselves, under the same accountability? And is it not the privilege of every

individual and of every presbytery, not to be denounced by the General Assembly as guilty of heresy or "immorality," without being first *proved* guilty, according to well-devised forms of trial, ordained for the purpose of preventing Lynch-law processes of ecclesiastical punishment?

In respect to the declaration, that "it has not been uncommon for the members of" certain "presbyteries, publicly and formally," "in a few extraordinary cases, to hold up the *system of truth which it* [the Confession] *contains*, as 'an abomination;' as a system which it were to be 'wished had never had an existence'"—we only say, that our confidence in the credulity and veracity of those who have made themselves responsible for it, forbids us to doubt that they believe it.

The Letter proceeds to justify the repeal of the "Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements," which was formed by mutual consultation between the General Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut, in 1801. The "plan of union" provided, first, that a Congregational church might have a Presbyterian minister for its pastor; secondly, that a Presbyterian church might have a Congregationalist for its pastor; and thirdly, that Presbyterians and Congregationalists in any place, not being sufficiently numerous to form two churches, might unite in one church. The theory of the arrangement was, that the Congregationalist minister or church-member should be dealt with on Congregational principles, and the Presbyterian on Presbyterian principles. The Presbyterian minister was of course responsible for his ministerial standing to his presbytery; but in case of difficulty between him and his Congregational flock, the difficulty might be referred, at the request of the church, to a council or arbitration mutually chosen, in equal numbers from each denomination. So the Congregational minister was to be responsible to his brother ministers of some association; and difficulties between him and his Presbyterian charge might be settled by an arbitration similarly chosen. The Congregationalist member of a mixed church was to be accountable first to a *quasi* session, called the standing committee, and then to the brotherhood. The Presbyterian was to be responsible first to the same committee, and then to the presbytery, where his case must be finally decided, unless the church should consent to its being carried farther. In the presbytery such a church might be represented at any time by a delegate from its standing committee. The practical working of this plan has been, probably, very much what was intended by its

authors. The ministers have all been Presbyterians. The churches have been at first Congregational in their internal government, and Presbyterian in their external relations; and after a sufficient training and shaping by their Presbyterian ministers, they generally become wholly Presbyterian. Without this plan, Congregationalism and Presbyterianism would have been throughout the country, as they are henceforward likely to become, opposite and rival sectarian interests. And wherever the Presbyterian Calvinist of Scotland or of Ulster, and the Congregational Calvinist of New England, came in contact, as in every district of the West, instead of there being a little collision, and a gradual giving up of differences, and a final amalgamation, there would have been such a tug of sectarian war as "when Greek meets Greek." Under the operation of this plan, Western New York and Northern Ohio, to say nothing of regions farther west, have been filled with churches whose faithfulness, notwithstanding any imperfections, incident to their youth, and to the unformed, effervescent character of the communities with which they are growing, is worthy to be "spoken of throughout the whole world." This is the system against which the self-styled "friends of truth and order" in the Presbyterian church, have for several years been increasingly clamorous, and which the last General Assembly "abrogated."

The reasons for this act of abrogation, as given in the Letter before us, are, that by the Plan of Union, Congregationalists acquired power over Presbyterians, without giving up their own liberty; that the plan was unnatural in its character, unconstitutional in respect to the Presbyterian church, and deeply injurious in its influence on Presbyterian order and discipline; and that it had been abused by those who had taken advantage of it to disseminate their pernicious errors. The act itself, as it appears in the printed minutes, is more luminous than the vindication of the act in the encyclical epistle. The abrogating resolution states, first, that the plan was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of the General Assembly; secondly, that the General Association of Connecticut had no authority over the Congregationalists in the new settlements; and thirdly, that "much confusion and irregularity have arisen from this unnatural and unconstitutional system."

The argument from the unconstitutionality of the Plan of Union on the part of the General Assembly, it is not for us to meddle with. We leave it, therefore, to the doctors of the canon law. To them too, we leave the question, whether it

was quite pertinent in the abrogating Assembly to pronounce judgment on the constitutionality of the act of the General Association of Connecticut, approving of the Plan of Union. But as it is solemnly asserted, that the General Association has "no power to legislate in such cases," we may be permitted to say, that to that body belongs all the power which, by the laws of common sense or of christianity, appertains to an assembly of christian pastors convened by delegation for the purpose of promoting, by consultation and advice, the welfare of all the churches; and this is power enough to do all that the Association attempted to do in approving the Plan of Union submitted to them by their brethren of the General Assembly. To do this, it was not necessary "to enact laws to regulate churches not within their limits;" nor did they attempt any such thing. Certain stipulations were proposed, by which Congregational churches, finding it convenient, might settle Presbyterian ministers. The General Association approved and recommended, or, if you please, "adopted" the scheme as their own. No church or minister was to be bound by these stipulations, save the church and the minister who should choose to enter into such a mutual contract. Was this "legislation?" Was this "enacting laws to regulate churches?" One might as wisely say, that the lawyer who draws up a form of a contract between John and Richard, which becomes valid whenever the said John and Richard choose to make it with proper solemnities, "had no power to legislate." So of the plan by which a Congregational minister might become the pastor of a Presbyterian church: the approving, the recommending, the adopting of such a plan, by the General Association, imposed no obligation on any minister or any church; the plan was *only* a "plan," a form of a contract to be entered into by any who should choose to enter into such mutual engagements. So of the plan for the formation of a mixed church: it formed no church; it regulated none. It was a "plan" according to which a church might be formed; and the provisions of which would be binding upon such persons as should choose to unite in forming a church under these mutual stipulations.

But was nobody else brought under any obligation, when the Plan of Union began to go into effect? We are very far from saying so. The General Association, having given such advice to their brethren in the new settlements, came under an obligation to all those brethren who followed the advice, not to do anything contrary to either the form or the spirit of the

plan, and especially, not to oppose or denounce, or distrust any ministers or churches, as violating the principles of Congregational order, simply because they practice according to the plan. And did not the General Assembly come under the same obligation? The General Association also became bound, virtually, if not by the letter of the transaction, to do nothing, by its agents or missionaries, for the propagation of Congregationalism, as an interest opposed to Presbyterianism, in those new districts in which inhabitants of both denominations were intermingled. The people there were to be left to form churches, Presbyterian, or Congregational, or mixed, according to their own discretion, without any influence from the General Association of Connecticut. And did not the General Assembly come under a corresponding obligation? Nay, by the very letter of the "Regulations," it was "strictly enjoined on all the missionaries [from either body] to the new settlements, to endeavor, by all proper means, to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation between those inhabitants of the new settlements who hold the Presbyterian, and those who hold the Congregational form of church government." For all this, on its own part and on the part of those under its control, the General Association became responsible, by acceding to the Assembly's Plan of Union.

The General Assembly came under another obligation. They voluntarily pledged themselves, that the delegate from the standing committee of a church formed under the Plan of Union, should "have the same right to sit and act in the presbytery, as a ruling elder in the Presbyterian church." With this stipulation the General Association had nothing to do, save perhaps to remonstrate against any violation of it.

The Plan of Union, then, was clearly a compact, first between the General Assembly and the General Association; secondly, between each of these bodies and those Congregationalists and Presbyterians in the new settlements, who might choose to accept the proposals made to them; and thirdly, among the individuals actually united in mixed churches, according to the provisions of the plan. The General Assembly now denies, that it had any right to make such a covenant, or having made it, to keep it. We admit, that their engagements in this covenant were greater than those undertaken by the General Association, and *may* have transcended the powers conferred on the Assembly by the letter of the Presbyterian constitution. But when the Assembly go farther, and imply, that the General Association of Connecticut, in agreeing to the

covenant, was guilty of intentional or heedless usurpation, we reply, that the right of the Association to do, and to bind itself to do all that it actually engaged to do, either expressly or by implication, needs only to be clearly stated, and it is incapable of denial.

As to the "confusion and irregularity" which are said to have been caused by the Plan of Union, it ought, perhaps, to be presumed, that the General Assembly, in a solemn resolution, and in a solemn letter "to all churches throughout the earth," would not speak unadvisedly. Yet we do not find, that "confusion and irregularity," in any such sense of the words as is current with all churches throughout the earth, have been proved to exist in those districts where the Plan of Union has been in operation, more than in other districts similarly situated. Some disorder is incidental to every thing which has to do with the workings of human nature, unsanctified, or sanctified in part. Some more is inseparable from the natural effervescence of society in a new country, where as yet nothing is venerable but the forests, falling under the ax of the pioneer, and the roaring cataracts, diverted from their ancient employment of "notching God's centuries in the eternal rock," to be the servants of inventive and all-conquering man. Something more of the same kind is to be expected from an age alive with the excitement of great revolutions, accomplished and in progress. If this is what the General Assembly mean by "confusion and irregularity," doubtless as much of it can be found in the districts referred to, as in other districts where the same influences have operated; but to ascribe it to the Plan of Union, is as idle as if we should ascribe it to the odd nomenclature of towns in the central region of New York. "What else is to be expected," we might say, "but confusion and irregularity," where Homer, Virgil, and Ovid, Marcellus, Scipio, and Pompey, Utica, Syracuse, and Rome, Whitestown and Smithfield, Oriskany and Skeneateles, are so strangely mingled together? Perhaps, however, by "confusion and irregularity," the Assembly mean something more than incidental agitation and excitement. What is it, then? If they mean anxious-seats, protracted meetings, camp meetings, and the like, who needs to be informed, that all these things originated and are still flourishing where the Plan of Union never had a being? If they mean extemporaneous preaching, loud and long, abounding in coarse illustrations, expressed in homely language, put together without much respect for Murray or Webster, and pronounced, perhaps, not

very "trippingly," we suspect a disinterested inquirer would find as much of that in many a region where for aught that the Plan of Union has ever done, "order reigns" as completely as "in Warsaw." If they mean the neglect of the discipline of Christ's family—allowing ministers and church-members, unrebuked and uncensured, to dishonor the gospel, by neglecting religious duties, by conformity to the world, by grinding the faces of the poor, by keeping back the wages of them that reap their fields, by permitting heathenish ignorance and gross wickedness in their own households, or by outrages against the regular administration of justice; we need not say, that in this respect the districts infected with the Plan of Union will bear comparison with any other district included in the bounds of the Presbyterian church. "*Common fame*" has told sad stories about the unrebuked and uncensured delinquencies of Presbyterian ministers and church-members in those "orthodox" regions, where no Plan of Union is known, save that which unites Congregationally nurtured ministers with Presbyterian heiresses, and the sordidness of slave-driving with the sacredness of pastoral functions. When has it ever been charged upon Presbyterian ministers and brethren in Western New York and Northern Ohio, that they permit their servants and dependents to live and die in ignorance of God and the bible?—that they allow men and women under their absolute government to dwell together in connections which the laws will not protect, which no religious rites have hallowed, and which are liable to be sundered by caprice as well as by a thousand accidents?—that helpless women, placed by the laws under their exclusive protection, find in them no adequate protection from the lust or from the cruelty of brutal overseers?—that by sheer force they put asunder those whom God has joined together by the strongest and tenderest natural affections, in the most sacred natural relations?—that they get gain by selling and buying their fellow-men, and even their fellow-communicants at Christ's table? Yet such "confusion and irregularity" as is implied in neglecting to discipline with rebuke and excommunication the perpetrators of such sins, is charged by "*common fame*" upon large portions of the Presbyterian church. When were Presbyterian church-members and elders, in Utica, Rochester, Buffalo, Cleaveland, or Sandusky, ever charged with the atrocity of acting on a Lynch committee, and thus co-operating in the public infliction of barbarous cruelties upon the person of a christian brother, a free citizen, whom no law condemned, and whom any tolerable government would

have protected, if possible, with a thousand bayonets? Yet common fame reports, that this was done by Presbyterian elders and brethren in the "orthodox" city of Nashville; and that it was winked at by the judicatories. We do not say that these things are truly reported; on the contrary, we try hard not to believe them, as reported of christian professors and christian churches; but we do say, that they are reported, to use the words of Mr. Breckinridge, "in a multitude of forms, such as books, pamphlets, periodical reviews, newspapers, and controversial tracts." And *we believe*, and the whole world believes, that the common fame which reports these things, is at least as trustworthy as the common fame which, through her blaring trumpet, cries aloud about the confusion and irregularity so prevalent in the districts where the Plan of Union has been practiced.

It may be said, that we are still wide of the mark, and that the words "confusion and irregularity," as used by the General Assembly, mean something very different from a neglect on the part of judicatories to apply the discipline of the church to known offenders, or to inquire into reported offenses. Very likely; but the question comes again, What is the meaning? Is it, that christian ordinances are not regularly maintained where the Plan of Union operates? But the extent to which the churches of that wide region are supplied with an uninterrupted administration of the word and sacraments by ordained ministers, is as notorious, and as marvelous, as the increase of its population, and the magical birth and growth of its cities; and any interpretation of the words, which denies a fact so unquestionable, must be rejected. Is it then, that the churches there, are, many of them, not supplied with settled pastors, and that the pastoral relation is often dissolved? It is a fact, that in that growing country, churches often outgrow their pastors, and pastors sometimes outgrow their churches. It is a fact, that churches there often calculate so largely upon growing, that they postpone the permanent settlement of a pastor till they shall feel themselves able to support one in a style proportioned to their expected importance. It is true, that the published statistical accounts show sometimes large presbyteries there, in which, while almost every church has a "stated supply," only some three or four have pastors duly installed. It is true, that this state of things is less desirable than what might be. But is it caused by the Plan of Union? What is the aspect of some other portions of the Presbyterian church? We take the statistical reports published by the last

General Assembly. Beginning at the bottom of the catalogue, we inquire how many of the churches are blessed with regular pastors? The presbytery of Louisiana, with ten ministers and thirteen churches, has only *one* pastor. The presbytery of Arkansas, with six churches, has seven ministers, five of whom are missionaries to the Indians from the American Board, and the other two are not described at all. The presbytery of Clinton, in Mississippi, with nine ministers and thirteen churches, has *no* pastor. The presbytery of Mississippi, with ten ministers and thirteen churches, has *two* pastors. The presbytery of Tombeckbee, with eight ministers and twelve churches, has *no* pastor. Tuscaloosa, with ten ministers and fifteen churches, has *one* pastor. South Alabama, with thirteen ministers and thirty-one churches, has *three* pastors. Thus far the settlements, it may be said, *are* too new. But now we enter an older country. Hopewell presbytery, in Georgia, with eighteen ministers and forty churches, has *three* pastors. The presbytery of Georgia, with ten ministers and nine churches, has *four* pastors, one of whom is a pastor of a Congregational church, not of the nine. Charleston Union, with twenty-eight ministers, and eight churches, has (if we include one who lacks only the formality of installation) twelve pastors, four of whom are pastors of independent churches. Here we find one part, at least, of the Plan of Union, and yet no signs of peculiar "confusion and irregularity," but, on the contrary, every church enjoys its own pastor. Proceeding in our survey, we come next to the presbytery of Harmony, which, with twenty-two ministers and twenty-eight churches, has *seven* pastors, two of whom are co-pastors in one church. Bethel, with ten ministers and twenty churches, has *five* pastors settled in eight churches. Not to be too tedious, we pass at a leap from South Carolina into Tennessee; and here we find, presbytery of Nashville, nine churches, nine ministers, *one* pastor; presbytery of West Tennessee, eleven ministers, sixteen churches, *one* pastor; presbytery of French Broad, eight ministers, fourteen churches, *one* pastor; presbytery of Union, (no allusion, we presume, to the Plan of Union,) twenty-six ministers, thirty churches, *one* pastor. In the state of Virginia, we find, that the four presbyteries, with one hundred and four ministers and one hundred and thirty-six churches, have *thirty-six* pastors. From such details, it may be safely inferred, that the districts in which the Plan of Union operates, are not very singular in this respect. Is it not their greatest singularity, in this respect, that certain judicatories, in those

districts, such as the synod of Geneva, and, if we mistake not, some others, have remonstrated with their churches on the neglect of the pastoral office, while in other regions synods and presbyteries have been silent? And are their efforts to remedy an evil which they suffer in common with almost all parts of the Presbyterian church, proof, that confusion and irregularity result from the Plan of Union?

There is yet another construction which may be given to the allegation, that "much confusion and irregularity have arisen" from the Plan of Union. It may mean, that the delegates from the churches formed in consequence of the Plan of Union, do not vote right in the General Assembly; that they stand like a phalanx for the privilege of bestowing their contributions where they please, and through such agencies as they may prefer; that they will not believe the common fame which denounces as heretics such men as Beecher and Barnes; and that so long as the Plan of Union continues, the anti-New England party cannot hold a steady and undisputed majority. That this is the real meaning of the allegations, seems probable from the answer to the protest offered by the minority against the abrogating resolution. In that document, the majority, "for proof" that the Plan of Union "has laid the deep foundation of lasting confusion," "refer to the recorded votes of the last and present General Assemblies, from which it abundantly appears, that the representatives of churches formed on this plan, have always opposed the Boards of Education and of Missions, and the efforts towards reform, and the suppression of errors and of schismatical contentions." Undoubtedly, votes contrary to the will of the convention party, especially when given in such numbers as to make its ascendancy at the best exceedingly precarious, are, in the eyes of that party, "confusion and irregularity" of the most alarming kind; but that such an offense will be recognized by the impartial judgment of all Christendom, as a good reason for abrogating a covenant that had stood sacred for the third part of a century, is not so obvious.

But leaving the question of the reasons for abrogating the Plan of Union, was the manner of proceeding right? Was it right to strike so hastily and annihilate it at a blow; or did christian courtesy require some conference, if not with the churches enjoying the benefits which that plan secured to them by the plighted faith of the General Assembly, at least with the General Association of Connecticut, by whose mediation the compact with those churches had originally been in-

stituted? The Circular Letter does not pass over this unpleasant aspect of the case. It asserts, that "this measure was not either hastily conceived, nor abruptly executed." It says:

'The General Assembly of 1835, respectfully requested the General Association of Connecticut to consent that the Plan of Union in question should be annulled. Having now waited two additional years in vain for any favorable action in the case, on the part of our brethren of Connecticut, and having witnessed with the deepest sorrow the ever growing evils of this relation, we have felt at this time solemnly called upon to abrogate the whole Plan, and to put an end, as far as in us lay, to the destructive effects which have so long resulted from its operation.' p. 10.

It so happens, that the General Assembly of 1835 did not request the General Association of Connecticut to consent that the Plan of Union should be annulled. The Assembly of 1835 did indeed resolve to make such a request; but no such request was ever presented to the General Association of Connecticut. There are certain forms by which requests from one of these corresponding bodies to the other are prepared and answered. Of these forms—not arbitrary, but necessary—such sticklers for order were not ignorant, and ought not to have been negligent. We do not remember, that the General Association has ever had occasion to ask any favors of the General Assembly, or to make any proposals to them; but when the Assembly has had anything to ask of the Association, they have ordinarily communicated their request in writing, authenticated by the signature of their clerk, through their delegates to the Association, or in extraordinary cases they have sent a special commission. In this instance they did neither. The minutes of the Assembly of 1835, do not show, that either the clerks or the delegates or any other persons were charged with the duty of communicating anything to the General Association of Connecticut. How then was this resolve of the General Assembly, touching the Plan of Union, to come under the cognizance of the Association. We remember well, that the Association met at Enfield, in 1835, in the expectation, that the request, of which many had heard by the common fame of the newspapers, would be a matter for serious consideration; but no request was communicated.

But the abrogation of the Plan of Union, was equity, good faith, and courtesy, when compared with the acts which followed, excising from the Presbyterian church, first, the Synod of the Western Reserve, and then the three great Synods of

Western New York. Of these acts the Circular speaks as follows :

‘ If it were obviously equitable and important, that the Plan of Union alluded to should be annulled, it was in our view no less equitable and important, that the ecclesiastical bodies to which that Plan had given existence, and which were animated and governed by its spirit, should be declared to be no longer connected with our church. It has been indeed painful to the Assembly to declare bodies in which were brethren, whose piety we cannot question, and whose activity in extending the visible church we must regard with approbation, to be no longer connected with our body. But we were shut up to this painful duty. Being irregularly brought into our church, and retaining all the feelings and habits growing out of the circumstances of their original introduction, we could not hope that they would walk together in peace with us, so long as the points of difference between us were so many and so serious. Although the creation of more churches on the Plan of Union was made to cease by the previous act of abrogation, still, as all must grant that the act which brought them in was wholly unconstitutional ; and, as if this were the case, the act itself was of course void from the beginning, and all the acts and bodies growing out of it equally void—we have deemed it necessary to declare the brethren connected with those judicatories no longer connected with the Presbyterian church.’ pp. 10, 11.

This is the whole argument. It is, that the four Synods were not put out of the Presbyterian church at all, but were never really connected with it. It is, that the acts of the Assembly excising, or absconding, did not cause anything to be true which was not true before, but only declared a truth previously overlooked. If the act is justified on this ground, this, of course, must be the whole argument. The argument may be amplified by explanations ; it may be defended against objections ; but it cannot be reinforced by supplementary considerations drawn from the alledged irregularities or heresies of the excised churches, or from the impossibility of their agreeing with that which calls itself the old school party. Irregularity or heresy, not merely alledged but proved, may be a good ground for censure and excommunication ; but charges of irregularity or heresy against these Synods, are at the best highly impertinent, when adduced in justification of an act which professes only to declare a truth, which, if it is a truth at all, would be equally a truth though the synods were as orthodox as the Biblical Repertory, and as regular as a regiment of professors of Ecclesiastical Polity. The impossibility of living under an existing state of things, may be a very good ar-

gument for revolution ; but has nothing to do with a question of constitutionality or validity.

The argument, then, the whole argument, in vindication of the excision of the four synods, consists of two parts—an alledged fact and an asserted principle. It is alledged as a fact, that the relation of those synods to the Presbyterian church was formed by the Plan of Union. It is asserted as a principle, that the abrogation of the Plan of Union annihilates all the rights that have been acquired, and all the relations that have been formed by it, or under its operations.

The alledged fact is neither conceded nor proved. On the contrary, it is notoriously not a fact, in manner and form, as alledged. Everybody knows, that over the whole extent of country from Utica to Sandusky, churches are planted here and there, which, from their first organization, have been strictly conformed to Presbyterianism. The Plan of Union formed no synods and no presbyteries. The presbyteries which were erected by the General Assembly into the Synod of Utica, were formed from time to time by the Synod of Albany. Were those presbyteries made up exclusively of churches organized under the provisions of the Plan of Union? If, for example, when the Presbytery of Oneida was formed, it included three churches and ministers, strictly presbyterian, then the formation of that presbytery was not invalid. And if it now includes three such churches and ministers, then, though the relation of every other church and minister to the Presbyterian body be annihilated by the abrogation of the Plan of Union, the relation of the presbytery remains untouched. So of all the presbyteries in all the synods. The unconstitutional and invalid formation of the presbyteries is to be proved of each presbytery singly ; and of many of them it is notorious, that the contrary can be proved.

But what of the principle? On this point, after all that has been said in so many quarters, and especially after the elaborate legal opinions which have been given by some of the most distinguished jurists, we shall not go over the ground anew, nor shall we attempt to repeat or sum up the views which are already so familiar to intelligent readers. Yet, as bystanders perfectly indifferent, if we know our own interests and feelings, in regard to the final decision of this matter, we may venture one or two suggestions.

First, then, what is the precise import of the word "abrogate?" To *abrogate*, says Webster, is "to repeal ; to annul by an authoritative act ; to abolish by the authority of the maker or

his successor ; applied to the repeal of laws, decrees, ordinances, the abolition of established customs, &c." The word used by the Assembly was exactly the right word ; the Plan of Union, so far as it was a law of the Presbyterian church, was *repealed* by the authority that made it, not set aside, as of no force, by a higher authority. This is a distinction which all the reasonings in vindication of the excision have failed to recognize. Nor is this distinction unimportant. There is, we believe, an act of Congress which gives certain exclusive pre-emption rights to squatters on the unsurveyed public lands. After many years, when thousands of citizens hold their estates by a title which this law has given them, Congress, we will suppose, becomes convinced of the unconstitutionality as well as impolicy of the law, and therefore repeals it, stating its unconstitutionality as one reason for the repeal. This, of course, prevents the farther acquisition of lands in the same way, but cannot annihilate the titles already acquired. But suppose that, instead of an abrogation of the law by Congress, a case of a title acquired under the act had been carried into the Supreme Court, and there the law, by an authority of another and higher kind, had been set aside as contrary to the supreme law, and therefore null from the beginning ; then, indeed, the squatters would have been as badly off, in respect to their lands, as those churches who have trusted to the faith of the General Assembly now seem to be in respect to their ecclesiastical relations. We do not forget, that the General Assembly claims to be a judicial body. But can a judicial body set aside *its own acts* as void from the beginning, and thus annihilate rights and relations that have resulted from those acts ? Can the Supreme Court of the United States now reverse the decision which it gave of the points of law in the Dartmouth College case, and thus annihilate retrospectively the rights and powers of the existing corporation ? Undoubtedly the same authority that made can abrogate ; but it must be a judicial authority, *proceeding judicially*, that can set aside anything as void from the beginning. Take this away, and law henceforward has no stability, and can give us no security.

But was the act of excision a judicial act ? Ask any lawyer whether there can be a judicial act without a judicial investigation. The House of Lords, in Great Britain, is at once a branch of the legislature and a judicial body. Can the House of Lords act *judicially* and set aside its legislative acts from the beginning, without proceeding according to judicial forms, trying a specific case, and hearing the parties as parties under trial ?

We submit another view. Admitting, for argument's sake, that the Plan of Union and other acts by which the churches of the excluded Synods were brought into connexion with the Presbyterian body, were extra-constitutional, or, even, clearly contra-constitutional; may not a prescriptive validity accrue, in the lapse of time, by the continued acquiescence of all parties, to an act or relation, which, had it been seasonably and properly called in question, might have been adjudged invalid? If an agent, with a limited power of attorney, goes beyond the discretion allowed him, he indeed cannot plead his want of authority as a reason for not fulfilling his engagements, but his principal may refuse to fulfill the contract, on the ground, that he never empowered that agent thus to engage in his behalf. Yet the principal must seasonably disown the contract. If he silently and knowingly permits the business to proceed; still more, if he enjoys the benefits which are to arise to himself from the contract; then, even though by the letter of the power of attorney, the agent was expressly forbidden to make such a contract, the principal, by his participation, or even by his silence, binds himself as strongly as by a written covenant. This doctrine has been applied to the case in question to show, that the Plan of Union, after the lapse of thirty-six years, is binding not only upon the General Assembly, but upon its constituency, the whole Presbyterian church; and to us the application seems to be irresistible. But our Presbyterian brethren are pleased with higher analogies. To them, if we do not misunderstand their reasonings, the Presbyterian church seems like a sovereignty, and the General Assembly is the organ through which all the powers of the sovereignty manifest themselves. To please them, then, let us trace one of those more august analogies which they seem to admire. The principle which we have stated is, like other principles of common law, a principle of natural equity, and as such it is no less applicable to the transactions of sovereign states and nations, than to the doings of the humblest individuals. We take for our instance of its application on the grand scale, the proceedings of the government of the United States in acquiring Louisiana. These proceedings at the time were of doubtful constitutionality, and acknowledged to be so by the President himself. All parties, however, the national government, the States, the People, acquiesced in the arrangement, as required by a necessity above the constitution; and State after State has been added to the Union in pursuance of the treaty of acquisition. Suppose now that, in the progress of political

contention, that constitutional question should be revived. Suppose the People and the States declare against the power of the President and Senate, or of Congress, to annex new territories to the Union. Suppose Congress, by a solemn resolve, disclaims the power. Suppose the Supreme Court declares in due form, that such acts of government are contrary to the letter of the constitution. All this may be a sufficient bar against a similar treaty for the acquisition of Canada or Texas; but does it dissolve the now existing union? Yes, say the General Assembly and their defenders: "The treaty of acquisition, being unconstitutional, was null and void from the beginning, and all the acts and bodies growing out of it are equally void." No, we reply, in the name of common justice and common sense: "The states which have been formed under the treaty of acquisition, are actually connected with the union by a bond as sacred and indissoluble as the constitution itself."

We shall not here undertake to examine at large the doctrines set forth in this Letter respecting Missionary and Education societies. They are doctrines which, thus announced, in the name of the General Assembly, deserve a more extended exposure than we can now bestow upon them. To us they seem to secularize the church, and to lay a broad foundation for an ecclesiastical despotism.

'We believe, that if there be any departments of christian effort to which the church of Christ is bound, in her appropriate character, to direct her attention and her unwearied labors, they are those which relate to the training of her sons for the holy ministry, and sending the gospel to those who have it not, and planting churches in the dark and destitute portions of the earth. To be willing to commit either of these branches of her peculiar work to foreign and irresponsible hands, we are more and more persuaded is unfaithfulness to the best interests of Zion, and adapted fatally to injure the cause of gospel truth and of Presbyterian order. Surely if the church is under obligations, not only to maintain in her own bosom, but also to impart as far as possible to the whole world, all such religious knowledge, worship, and ordinances, as God hath revealed in his word, she is bound to see to it, that no persons shall be either educated or sent forth as ministers who are not well instructed in her doctrine and order, and, as far as can be ascertained, firmly attached to both.' p. 12.

The church, then, according to the General Assembly, "is bound to see to it, that *no persons* shall be either educated or sent forth as ministers, who are not well instructed in her doctrine and order, and as far as can be ascertained, firmly attached

to both." And how is she to see to it? Why, by taking the work of educating young men for the ministry, and the work of sending forth and supporting those who are to preach the gospel, into her own hands. If this argument is good against the American Education Society, it is equally good not only against the individual who undertakes to educate for the ministry an individual beneficiary, but also against the father who educates his own son for the ministry, and against the young man who, without aid from anybody, educates himself. If it is good against the Home Missionary Society, it is equally good against the individual who subscribes to aid in supporting the individual minister of a particular congregation; nay, it is equally good against every congregation which supports its own minister, unless the congregation and "the church" are confounded. The congregation, as organized and incorporated for the support of christian worship and instruction, is not the church, but a voluntary society. The "ecclesiastical society," as we call it in New England, which builds and holds the meeting-house, which concurs with the church in the settlement or dismissal of the minister, and with which the minister is connected by a civil contract, is a *home* missionary society: and where is the church which does not directly or indirectly avail itself of some such aid in supporting the ministry?

One word here in respect to the American Board of Foreign Missions. We have no desire to see all the contributions which the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of this land ought to pour out for the propagation of the gospel among the unevangelized, flowing through that one channel. No consideration of economy, or harmony, or efficiency, seems to us to require it. Two or more societies, with so much of concert as would keep their operations from clashing, at home and abroad, would be far better and safer than one. If our brethren in the middle and southern States would peacefully form another society on the same principles on which Protestant missions have been so generally conducted, we should rejoice in the movement. We do not like their plan of making the missionary spirit a means of strengthening the power of Presbyterian judicatories; but if they, with their ecclesiastical Board of Foreign Missions, will but be peaceable, we will keep the peace on our part, trusting in God, and, under him, in the truth, and in the enlarging and liberalizing spirit of the missionary work, to counteract any tendencies to ecclesiastical domination which may be involved in their system. In ex-

pressing these views, we have no reason to think, that we differ from the entire body of our brethren in the churches of New England. And if those members of the American Board, who are so fixed and conscientious in their distrust of voluntary societies, and so zealous in proclaiming their preference for ecclesiastical organizations, should immediately resign their seats, and give their undivided energies to the Presbyterian Board, newly constituted by the General Assembly, we dare say, that from Byram River to the disputed boundary, there would be uttered not a word of complaint, and, beyond what propriety might require, not a word of regret.

A paragraph against Radicalism, quite in the style of Mr. Calvin Colton, so far as thought is concerned—a paragraph disavowing hostility to revivals of religion—a profession of love to all churches—a short prayer—and a benediction—constitute the remainder of this Letter. All these things we pass over without commentary, that we may give the remainder of this article to some other topics connected with the great catastrophe of the last General Assembly.

The churches of four Synods, probably the most vigorous and flourishing body of the same extent within the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, and not the least fruitful in works of piety, have been excluded, by a violent revolutionary act, contrary to all the forms and principles of justice, from their connection with the Presbyterian denomination. What is their duty under this wrong?

Shall they submit in silence, resolving, that if the General Assembly can live without them, they will live without the Assembly? There are many obvious arguments for submission. Peace is worth purchasing at the sacrifice of many of the rights of the purchaser. Submission to wrong, when submission compromises only our personal interests and feelings, is the first impulse of a christian spirit, and the stern dictate of christian duty.

But have they a right to submit? If the validity of the proceedings were unquestioned, if the wrong, however grievous, admitted of no lawful remedy, the duty of submission, and of course the right to submit, would be unquestionable. But the case being as it is, the probability being so considerable, that the proceedings in question will yet be decided to be illegal and invalid, have those churches a right, for the sake of peace, or for any other prudential consideration, to abandon their claim? If, to any considerable extent, the titles by which they hold their meeting-houses, and other parochial

property, are affected by the act of excision—and to what extent this is the fact no man can yet inform us—then obviously they cannot submit. The rights of their fathers and brethren, who have fallen asleep and left this property in their keeping, the rights of their children, and of their unborn posterity, for whose use, in the worship of God, this property was given, may not be tamely surrendered.

In another view, the question whether the excised churches have a right to submit to the act of excision, demands a grave consideration. The General Assembly, as representing the whole Presbyterian church, holds in trust for various religious and charitable uses, besides the lands, buildings, and libraries of the Theological Seminaries at Princeton and Alleghany, more than one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars in "stocks and other securities." This property was given, to be controlled, and its income to be expended, not by a fragment of the Presbyterian church, greater or smaller, but by the whole church, by the representatives of the life and enterprise of New York, as well as of the sturdy stiffness of Pennsylvania, and the jealous ardor of the South. It was given to a church which, already rooted in all parts of the country, and enjoying great resources of intellectual and moral power, and combining, to a happy extent, the inventive and progressive New England spirit, with the strong conservative Scotch spirit, gave fair promise of doing more than any other ecclesiastical organization, towards filling the whole land with homogeneous christian institutions. The excised presbyteries, at the beginning of the last General Assembly, were, in law and in fact, a part of the constituency of that body by which these various trusts were to be administered. The property was in part committed to them, to be appropriated by them, in connection with others, for its intended uses. Has the trust, by any legal and valid process, been taken out of their hands? They think not; and in this opinion they are sustained, we will not say by public opinion, but, what is of more consequence, by the deliberate judgment of most learned and able jurists. If, then, they are not lawfully discharged of their responsibility in regard to this great public interest, can they justly retreat and abandon the deposit, simply because certain men have attempted unlawfully to wrest it out of their hands? We think not. When a part of the Trustees of Dartmouth College, availing themselves of an unconstitutional act of the legislature of New Hampshire, seized on the property and records of the corporation, and associating themselves with a

new board, excluded their former colleagues from their part in the management of the trust, was it the duty, was it the right, of the excluded party to succumb? They did not succumb. They resisted the invasion of their trust. They triumphed; and by their successful resistance they purchased not only for their own institution, but for all institutions similarly situated, a priceless security against legislative invasion. The resistance of the excised presbyteries to the wrong which they believe has been committed against them, and through them upon the great public interests of which they were with others the joint guardians, may involve results equally important.

They have determined, it seems, in their convention at Auburn, that they will not submit without a struggle. But how is this great question of justice, or rather of law, to be adjusted? By year after year of ecclesiastical agitation and electioneering? By resorting to the coercive power of public opinion? By contending till the party that holds the power in its own hands shall voluntarily reverse its proceedings? The question of the lawfulness of the act of excision, can be settled only by carrying it to the supreme tribunal of the nation. The Supreme Court of the United States, and no other arbiter, is competent to say decisively, whether the excised presbyteries are or are not a part of the Presbyterian church, as known in law. If the Supreme Court shall tell them that they have suffered no wrong, or that being wronged they have no remedy, then they may be sure that they incur no moral responsibility by submitting. If they do not intend to carry the question to the proper tribunal for a decision; if they do not hope that the law of the land will protect them and right them, they are wrong in agitating the churches and the public with any show of resistance.

We say then, let there be a suit amicably arranged between the parties, which shall bring the validity of the excising act, to the decisive test. The brethren of the concision have the same interest in the speedy and final determination of this matter, with the brethren of the excision. And however the parties may differ in other respects, they can agree in making the necessary arrangements for obtaining a judgment at the earliest period. Let us see which party is so far conscious of being in the wrong, that it will not trust its own cause in the hands of public justice. Let us see whether either party will dare, by needless technical delays, and by the arts of litigation, to prevent the other from obtaining a prompt and final decision.

It is greatly to be lamented, that the necessary negotiations and arrangements for an amicable suit, cannot take place before the tumultuous scene that is so likely to open the—tragedy, shall we call it?—or the farce of the Assembly of 1838.

Let it not be supposed, that in saying these things we regard the renewed and continued union of all the materials included in the Presbyterian church, as practicable or desirable. On the contrary, if the excised presbyteries should recover what they regard as their rights, the first and only effort of both parties should be to agree on such arrangements as shall prevent collision. What those arrangements might be, or ought to be, we will not undertake to decide. Our suggestions on such a subject would probably weigh but little with either party.

In view of the catastrophe which has fallen upon the Presbyterian church, and the legal difficulties in which so many congregations of that connection will be necessarily involved, we have been impressed more strongly than before with the folly of that congregation, which, for greater security, puts its meeting-house and other property out of its own control. Creeds and trust-deeds, pledging the house and property to the maintenance of an evangelical system of doctrine, may perhaps, if discreetly formed, answer some good purpose. But whether the security against perversion, which these afford, is sufficient to overbalance the inconveniences which they involve, is very questionable. In Boston, where, in consequence of the Unitarian defection, the trust-deed plan of building churches was popular a few years ago, we believe the experience of its inconveniences has caused it to be abandoned. Build your place of worship; organize your church on evangelical principles; let the church and parish be distinct, each having a negative upon the other in the settlement of a pastor; settle an intelligent, sound, faithful minister; and then, if you commit the whole to God, you have all the security against the future perversion of the property which you can reasonably ask for. Absolute security is impossible. But to connect the use of your parochial property with the chances and changes of another body, which, in proportion as its interests are more extended and various and complicated, than those of the parish, is more liable than the parish to agitation, corruption, and revolution—is somewhat akin to the sagacity of the shipwrecked wiseacre in Hierocles' jest-book, who thought to be sure of escape by lashing himself to the anchor. There are, as we are told, meeting-houses built and occupied by New

England congregations in the Western Reserve Synod, the title-deeds to which provide, that they shall be for the use of congregations under the care of the General Assembly. The congregations which have thus put their property out of their own control, are now prepared, doubtless, to appreciate the wisdom of the arrangement. If a people cannot trust themselves and their children; if they cannot trust the vital energy of the truth, and the good providence of the God of truth; let them trust the General Assembly.

There is another lesson to be learned from this catastrophe—a lesson which all ministers of the gospel especially will do well to ponder. Who does not see in the history of these proceedings, the danger of party organization, in respect to ecclesiastical or theological controversies, and particularly the danger of party conventions?

A religious party convention is almost necessarily a convention of conscientious backbiters. Its object is, by collecting all the statements and rumors that can be found to the disadvantage of the opposite party, to produce in its own members a more zealous and inflexible determination; and by deliberate and devout consultation, to concert the measures which shall coerce the neutral to a decisive stand, inspire the timid with courage, fill the gentle and affectionate with the spirit of excision, and baffle and disgrace the enemy? Can any impartial man read the debates of the preparatory Convention at Philadelphia, and not feel, that all the tendency of its proceedings was to kindle the fire of party spirit seven times hotter than it could have been otherwise? Can he read the speeches which were made there, not merely by Dr. Junkin and Mr. Breckinridge, but even by such men as good old Dr. Blythe, and not feel, that the Convention must have been a dangerous place for such as had sympathy enough with the party not to be struck with grief and pity? Can he pass from the Convention into the Assembly, and see with what fury the gladiators of the Convention rushed into the arena, like giants from their wine, and not feel, that the great effect of those previous consultations on such as took part in them, was to strengthen into inflexible enmity prejudices against their brethren, which might otherwise have wavered, and to give them tongues, indeed, "as of fire," but not of fire from heaven? Who does not realize the weakness of human nature, and the might of the temptations that belong to a party convention, when he sees two men who were understood to have come to that convention partly in the hope of restraining its dangerous tenden-

cies, among the foremost and loudest in the consequent uproar ; the one (Mr. Plumer) making himself renowned by insulting contradictions and abusive buffoonery, and the other, (Dr. Baxter,) as we learn on the authority of Mr. Breckinridge,* first striking out the conception of the great outrage which gives name to the Assembly of 1837? In the light of this great example, shining afar like the flame of some wide conflagration, who does not see, that when conscientious and religious men are brought together in a party convention—when they stir each other up to party zeal and courage with holy words of exhortation—when they shed pious tears over the accumulated reports of party prejudice, which, though a breath of impartial examination might scatter the cloudy mass, seem to their eyes as immovable as the mountains—when they devoutly pray, and perhaps break the sacramental bread over their vows of party fidelity ; then they are in a dreadful snare ; then there is danger, that their own errors of doctrine and of practice, instead of being corrected, will be aggravated ; then there is danger, that their sentiments in respect to brethren, who, if in error, and in lamentable error, may be brethren still, will verge close upon the malignity of a fanaticism.

We remember a certain Convention in Connecticut. Earnest discussion, which ought to have gone forward without any interruption of mutual confidence, had occasioned something like alienation between hearts once closely united, and which were still beating with kindred pulses of love to the Redeemer and his cause. Fame, with her hundred tongues, had scattered far and near her "ambiguous voices." Great evils, heresy, confusion, corruption, had been prognosticated in certain quarters. At last the crisis was thought to have come, and the letters missive went abroad, that convoked a meeting of "the friends of truth and order." With a careful discrimination, the letters were sent only to such as were deemed able to bear them. Of pastors dwelling side by side, in mutual helpfulness and love—of pastors joined in the watch of the same church, one was taken and another left. Some read the summons with pain, and with the rational fear, that evil would grow out of such a movement, but resolved to go, that they might "hold back" the inconsiderate and impetuous. The Convention came together ; there was prayer, and preaching, and devout conference about prevailing errors and the dangerous tendencies of the age ; there were eloquent, spirit-stirring

* See "The Presbyterian," Oct. 7, 1837.

addresses, such as, we dare say, were not heard at Philadelphia, for in the Convention of which we now speak, were men who, when a strong inward excitement moves them, "can play well upon an instrument." Other men were there, too well skilled in machinery and the management of excitements, not to know how to control any that were flexible enough to come into such a meeting at such a summons. And so, at the proper juncture, when everything was rightly tempered and prepared, there came out "painful disclosures" and "alarming developments" about the secret heresies of absent brethren—heresies, that waited for their avowal only till the public should be ripe for them. Had the brethren accused been present, to face their accusers, to offer one word of explanation or denial, the charm had been broken, and all had been baffled. But who, in the absence of contradiction, could refuse to believe such stories, told in the most convincing tones, and with eyes that "looked unutterable things?" The effect was a matter of course. They who came to hold back, remained to go forward; and the decisive steps were taken, which, without doing the least towards the refutation or suppression of error, tended, so far as human eye can see, to nothing else than to entail dissensions on the churches of Connecticut for ages.

Let every *young* minister especially beware how he is drawn into connection with party organizations, occasional or permanent. Ecclesiastical parties, party unions and conventions, threaten to destroy the communion and efficiency, the purity and piety of the churches, as political parties threaten all the interests of the commonwealth. "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; to their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united!"

ART. VII.—STONE'S LETTER ON ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

Letter to Dr. A. Brigham, on Animal Magnetism: being an account of a remarkable interview between the author and Miss Loraina Brackett, while in a state of somnambulism. By WILLIAM L. STONE. New York: George Dearborn & Co. 1837.

IN our last number, we went into a detailed examination of the recent report of the French Commission on Animal Magnetism—a report which has created quite a sensation in Europe, and which has been appealed to as furnishing a triumphant vindication of the mysteries of Animal Magnetism. Though

we considered the document in question not without value, we thought its reputation far greater than its merits. This, as we conceive, was abundantly shown. We proved it imperfect and general in its statements, loose and illogical in its reasonings, unphilosophical in its deductions, and unworthy of credit.

We now proceed to give some account of the state of the "science" in our own country, which has been making some very unexpected progress within the last few months. We shall confine our attention chiefly to Col. Stone's letter, because it is the most complete, authentic, and best known work upon the subject, with which our press has yet furnished us.

Col. Stone goes on the supposition, throughout his letter, that the facts of which he treats are not only susceptible of proof, but capable of being established by ordinary evidence. To this course we wholly object. We are amazed, that any man should think himself privileged to adopt it. However, in the examination which is to follow, we shall, for the most part, waive the argument concerning the physical impossibility of the alledged facts, and proceed just as though we were in possession of no vantage ground from this source. In other words, we shall proceed, generally, as if the occurrences to be noticed were of the ordinary character, not contradictory or absurd, but only marvelous, and capable of being proved by credible witnesses.

Col. Stone declares, "he is not a positive believer in the system" of Animal Magnetism, "to the whole extent claimed by Frederick Anthony Mesmer, the founder of the art, and contended for by Wolfart and Kluge, and the other German and French enthusiasts," and prays that his correspondent may not write him down "as a believer in the charlatanerie of Mesmer and Deslon, or as a disciple of M. Poyen, or as an encourager of the other strolling dealers in somnambulism, who traverse the country exhibiting their 'sleeping beauties,' as lovers, not of science, but of gain."

Again, the Colonel declares, that he "knows not what to believe;" that he has been brought "from the position of a positive sceptic to a dead pause;" that he has been "compelled, if not to relinquish, at least very essentially to modify his disbelief;" and that the question as to his present belief "would be a poser," &c., &c.

Once more, Col. Stone affirms, that he "cannot deny the evidences of his own senses;" that he saw under circumstances in which "collusion, deception, fraud, and imposture,

were alike out of the question ;" that his tale is "a simple, unadorned narrative of facts;" and that he "might easily fill a hundred pages more with incidents and illustrations of the most surprising character, which have occurred at Providence, and in its vicinity, within the last few months, in the course of the experiments that have been made—as well attested, too, as the battle of Bunker Hill, or the Declaration of Independence."

From all these declarations, and many more like them, we infer, that the author of the Letter to Dr. Brigham is in great tribulation of mind. He seems sorely puzzled to reconcile his present position as a dispenser of magnetic wonders, with the instinctive principles of his own mind, and the common sense of the world. In order to save his reputation, he wishes us to understand, that he is no "positive" believer in the charlatanism of Mesmer and Deslon. He is ever willing to denounce M. Poyen and his associates as charlatans and vagabonds—a rather ungenerous thing, by the way, particularly as he is so ready to acquit others of quackery, who are equally notorious as "dealers in somnambulism."

However, notwithstanding the Colonel's disclaimers, we have no doubt, that he is a thorough believer in all the wonders of Animal Magnetism—of Animal Magnetism, too, in its most extravagant form. Thus we are compelled to believe, provided he is an honest man, and his words are the expression of his thoughts. His qualified statements, and his feeble and hesitating declarations to the contrary, are nothing more than a device to preserve his fair name, and to save him from ridicule.

Col. Stone gives a sort of history of his own conversion to his present faith, which cannot fail to be of interest to the reader. Up to a very recent period, he claims to have been "a sturdy unbeliever" in Animal Magnetism, as exhibited in Rhode Island, considering it the work, "if not of credulity and imposture, at least of mental excitement, sympathy, and delusion." On the 22d of last August, a gentleman from Providence placed in his hands a letter of introduction "from a distinguished prelate in the Episcopal church, then on a visit to that city," inviting an investigation of the magnetic phenomena. He immediately entered into conversation with the bearer of the letter concerning the subject. The latter confirmed everything that our author had heard concerning the Providence somnambulists. He related many surprising facts concerning them, of the reality of which the Colonel "could

not entertain a doubt," without impeaching his character for truth ; and that his informant was "honest," or, in other words, that he had told the truth, his "manner" furnished convincing evidence.

Thus we see Col. Stone's faith was staggered on the information of the first stranger he appears to have met with from Providence. We may know, from the result of this conversation, what "a sturdy unbeliever" he actually was—how careful, how deliberate, how incredulous, he was likely to be as an investigator of the strange reports which had come to his ears. He was, in fact, a believer of some of the most marvelous tales on record, from the very hour of the interview with this stranger, as may be fairly inferred from his own declarations. A degree of evidence barely sufficient to establish the most ordinary and probable facts, is considered as ample proof of occurrences the most extraordinary and incredible.

Four days after this conversation, Col. Stone arrived in Providence, prepared and *expecting*, as we have just reason to believe, to see all the wonders of which he had heard. The frame of mind with which he entered upon and pursued the inquiry which he had resolved on instituting, we conceive of the utmost moment. It is well known, that he who believes in witches and ghosts is far more likely than others to find them. The position of a sudden convert to a faith so monstrous and exciting as that of a believer in the Animal Magnetism of Providence is, certainly, not very favorable for an impartial examination of the grounds of that faith. We cannot conceive it possible, that a man who has all at once adopted such a faith, and the views which it is calculated to inspire—who has given flight to his hopes, and wings to his imagination, can so far come down from his aerial flight, as to regard with the necessary attention the numerous and vulgar details which give character and weight to evidence. While in this state of mind, filled with extravagant anticipations, and inflamed with the zeal and impatience of a new convert, he cannot see objects in their true magnitude and colors. His eyes and his ears are unfaithful to their trust. They bring back false and exaggerated reports. Everything is inverted, or distorted, or magnified. Under these circumstances, a person cannot, though he would, write "a simple and unadorned narrative of facts." He is treading on enchanted ground. He is in a trance and sees visions, and therefore cannot be trusted, except with many grains of allowance. We would not trust our own eyes in such circumstances, (though they stand in

better credit with us than any body's else,) even when they testified to nothing but ordinary facts; therefore, Col. Stone must not complain if we receive his account with a degree of suspicion; especially, when that account is regarded as a statement of facts the most extraordinary and contradictory to all experience and all history.

After Col. Stone's arrival in Providence, he immediately commenced an inquiry concerning the tales of wonder of which he had heard so much. It resulted, as might be expected, in a confirmation of their truth. He was "satisfied," "by information derived from the most unquestionable authorities, that in regard to the case of this young lady, [the subject of his Letter,] the half that the case would warrant had not been told." "Of course [says he] my curiosity was greatly excited."

Here we have more evidence of the Colonel's cautiousness in making up an opinion, and of the sort of care which he would be likely to observe in the "experiments" which we are soon to notice. His conversion seems to have been complete even before he had seen the young lady, the subject of his pamphlet. His conversion, too, appears to have been wrought by something no more substantial than common rumor, or, at least, second-hand reports. We cannot but regard every part of the examination which follows, as instituted, not with the design of establishing and removing doubts, but for the purpose of gratifying an inordinate love of the marvelous, or of feasting the eyes on the great wonder of the day, and of witnessing facts and gathering materials with which to astonish the world. After having finished his preliminary inquiries, "my curiosity," says the Colonel, "was greatly excited, and my anxiety to see the young lady increased in a corresponding ratio." He had come all the way from New York for the purpose of seeing an apparition, and he was determined not to be disappointed.

The name of this young lady, to whose case we now proceed, is Loraina Brackett, aged about twenty, from the town of Dudley, Mass. "Four years since [says the account before us] she had the misfortune to have an iron weight of several pounds fall from a considerable height on the crown of her head. The injury was so severe as to deprive her almost of life, and entirely of her reason, for several months, during which time she was subject to the most violent nervous [spasms?] and other serious derangements of the nervous system. From the immediate effects of this injury she gradually recovered, and

at the end of the year her general health was partially restored. But notwithstanding this improvement of her bodily health, her eyes were so badly affected by this injury, as to produce *amaurosis*, a disease of the optic nerve, which threatened total blindness. As usual in cases of this disease, the loss of sight was very gradual, until, about eighteen months since, it was entirely extinguished. Simultaneously with the loss of sight, she sustained a loss of voice, so complete, that for fifteen months she was unable to utter a single guttural sound, and could only whisper almost inaudible tones."

Under these circumstances, Miss Brackett commenced the magnetical treatment about the middle of May last, under the charge of Dr. George Capron, who had had some experience as a magnetizer. This treatment was continued daily, with the exception of two brief intermissions, up to the time of Col. Stone's visit. "The results," says the Colonel, "have been most salutary. Her voice has been entirely restored, so that it is clear, and her enunciation distinct and agreeable. Her natural sight, moreover, has so far recovered from total blindness, that she can now distinguish light from darkness. She can, when awake, discern objects like shadows; though she cannot distinguish a man from a woman by the dress."

As to the alledged improvement which followed the magnetic treatment in Miss Brackett's case, we have nothing to add to that which was said in our last number, on the effects of excited imagination, expectation, confidence, &c., aided by time, on certain forms of disease. That there was a marked improvement in all the particulars named, is, at least, credible; but we see no need of a certain mysterious and unaccountable influence, termed the magnetic, to account for the effects. We have seen as wonderful, and far more perfect cures, which have resulted from the idle mummery of unquestioned mountebanks—cures, too, which nobody doubted were the result of a mental influence.

Concerning other points of interest, Col. Stone "was informed," that Miss Brackett "was a young lady of most respectable character, and of decided and unaffected piety;" and that Dr. Capron was "a physician of established reputation, and above all the devices and designs of quackery, charlatanism, or imposture."

"I was farther informed, [continues our author,] that the young lady was diffident and retiring in her manners, and of delicate and sensitive feelings; and that neither herself, her friends, nor her physician,

were ambitious of anything approaching to a public exhibition. On the contrary, they preferred remaining without public observation.' p. 12.

'Having thus satisfied myself [concludes our scrutinizing author] by information derived from the most unquestionable authorities, that however extraordinary might be the appearances, or however surprising the developments of the mysterious principle or influence asserted to exist by the magnetizers, yet neither Miss Brackett herself, nor her friends, nor her physician, would be guilty of deception, or accessory, directly or indirectly, to an imposture, the next step was, if possible, to obtain an interview.' pp. 12, 13.

Thus our "sturdy unbeliever" was prepared *to bolt* anything. Was there ever such an instance of headlong, unhesitating credulity? Was there ever a man that was so exposed, or that so deserved to be cheated? He had "satisfied" himself, even before he had seen the parties themselves, that there could be no trick, and he expects, that his readers will be satisfied too. He takes it for granted, that he shall not be imposed on, and is not likely, therefore, to take any measures to prevent imposition. Thus the professed and only rational object of the inquiry—the discovery of imposture, deception, collusion, &c.—is abandoned, never more to be taken up, even before the inquiry, in the proper sense, is begun.

After this, Col. Stone sought and obtained an interview with Miss Brackett and her friends, and an opportunity was soon given him of witnessing some experiments. Dr. Capron was the magnetizer.

'The process was chiefly by the action of the eyes, with some slight manipulations. In five minutes the patient gave signs of drowsiness, and in four minutes more she was in a deep and profound slumber—insensible, as was ascertained by experiment, alike to the touch and the voices of all present, excepting her physician.' pp. 15, 16.

Already we see the influence of the Colonel's undoubting faith. How did he know that Miss B. was in a profound slumber? or if he knew this, how did he know, that she was insensible to the touch and voices of all present except her physician? What were the "experiments" that were so decisive and satisfactory on this point? Did not the Colonel make up his mind from *appearances* which might be counterfeited? But he had already determined, that there could be no deception; therefore it was unnecessary to guard against error from this source; therefore it became him to be "satisfied."

Some experiments were now made to test Miss B's power of

clairvoyance, or mental vision. Various prints, likenesses, &c., were provided by a friend who was present. She appeared to see and admire the pictures, "though her eyelids were entirely closed; in addition to which cotton batts were placed over her eyes, and confined by a pair of green spectacles," to say nothing of her blindness when awake. "This fact [of her seeing and admiring the pictures] was tested in every way." Her mode of examining the pictures is described as follows:

'Invariably, when she studied a picture, she turned her back upon the wall against which it hung. When she took a print to examine it, she held it at the back of her head, or rather just over the parietal bone. * * * She took a portrait, and putting it to the side of her head, almost behind, as she remained alone, inquired, "Is not this a likeness of John Foster?—John—Yes, it is John Foster." She made no mistakes that were discovered.' pp. 17, 18.

In conclusion of this part of the subject, Col. Stone adds:

'Having satisfied ourselves of the wonderful powers of "vision without the use of visual organs," as exhibited upon these objects, and of which I have given but a brief outline,' &c. * * * * * p. 19.

Here, again, the Colonel expresses himself as *satisfied* without the use of any means, so far as we can see, to prevent deception or trick. He does not apparently take the most common and obvious precautions to ensure a fair trial of Miss B's powers. We are astonished, beyond measure, at the extent of his thoughtlessness, or rather credulity. It does not appear, that he took any steps to ascertain whether the pictures about which Miss B. remarked, had been seen before, or whether she might not have had an understanding with some one in regard to them. We are told that they were provided by a friend, but nothing more is said of them. Is this the way that a faculty so unheard of as that of seeing through the back of one's head, is to be ascertained and proved? But Col. Stone was *satisfied*—and so he was before these experiments were commenced—and so he would have been, there is reason to believe, had he been taught to expect any other monstrous and incredible thing.

Such is the commencement of that "course of examination," which was, as our author announces, to "test the case most thoroughly, and in a manner rendering deception, delusion, and imposition of every kind, entirely out of the question."

After having so satisfactorily ascertained the power of *clairvoyance*, Col. Stone now sets himself to finding out another

power, still more strange—the power of visiting other regions without changing her position, of examining and describing objects in New York, for instance, while still in Providence. In order that the Colonel might enjoy the exhibition of this wonderful power to his satisfaction, Miss Brackett's magnetizer clothed him with the privilege of enjoying her conversation; for it will be recollected, that Miss B's senses were not awake to the addresses of any body but him who had magnetized her, and those who had been placed *in communication* with her by an act of his will.

'Dr. Capron, by an exercise of the will, withdrew her attention from the whole circle to himself, and then gave her a particular introduction to me. Leading her to a seat, I sat down by her side, and the Doctor transferred her hand into mine, and clothed me with the power of enjoying her exclusive company.' p. 19.

The Colonel then commenced a "sprightly" conversation with her, "just as he would have done with any strange lady." "She invariably used very correct English." "I inquired, both of herself and friends, before she was magnetized, whether she had ever been in New York, and was assured that she had not." This testimony was of course satisfactory, and he at once determined to send, or rather accompany her, to New York, there to witness new exhibitions of her superhuman powers.

After some conversation about the mode of travel, they finally concluded "to go through the air."

"But you must not let me fall," said she.

Saying which she grasped my right hand more firmly—took my left hand—and pressed upon both, tremulously, as if buoying herself up. I raised my hands some ten or twelve inches, very slowly, favoring the idea that she was ascending. * * * And away in imagination we sailed.

* * * * *

"And here we are at New York. Come, we will descend at the north end of the battery."

She then grasped my hands more closely, and bore down exactly as though descending from a height.

"Safely down," said I. "There is the dock where the Providence steamboat comes in." pp. 20, 21.

After their arrival, they first paid a visit to Castle Garden, Miss B. *in fact*, and the Colonel in imagination. After some very general conversation, in which our author, be it remembered, always took the lead, he observed, that

‘She appeared to act cautiously, as though experiencing the sensations of stepping upon a bridge. I spoke too quickly, and said the bridge was perfectly safe, and we would walk along.

I then observed a smile playing upon her features. “What pleases you?” I inquired. “Why,” said she, “what a queer hat that man has got on.”

“What man?”

“Why, that man, there, with the large round hat, like a Quaker’s.”

“What sort of a coat has he on, or is it a jacket?”

“It is a round jacket—and look, his hat has a round, low crown.”

It instantly occurred to me that she had described the dress of the Castle Garden Boat Club, whose boat-house stands at the farther end of the bridge, where, also, their boat is moored. There is generally some one or more of the club at their room; and I doubt not that one of the members was then at the club-house, and was seen by Miss Brackett.’ pp. 22, 23.

Now, we would ask every candid reader, whether here is evidence of anything but the power of Colonel Stone’s excited imagination. The Colonel conducts his “fair companion” into Castle Garden, gives her to understand that he is passing a bridge, at whose farther end stands the boat house of a boat club. He inquires of her what she sees. She replies, a man with a queer hat on, like a Quaker’s. He again asks her, whether he wears a coat or a jacket? She answers, a jacket—and lo, there arises up before the astonished vision of our worthy author, a member of the Castle Garden Boat Club, whose dress “she had described,” and who, he “doubts not,” she saw; for “there is generally one or more of the club at their room!” We might safely challenge the world to produce, *out* of the work before us, such an instance of credulity. What absurdities some men will swallow, unbolted too, and without the shadow of a reason or necessity to excuse the act!

After lingering about the battery a moment, our *somnambulists* start on a walk up Broadway:

“And here we are by the Bowling-Green,” I remarked. “How do you like it?”

“It is very pretty.”

“Well; here is Mr. Ray’s house—how do you like it?”

“It is a splendid house.”

“On the left hand,” said I. She then extended her hands to the left, as if curiously examining something by the touch. “I saw something like this at Washington,” she remarked, [referring, the Colonel thinks, to some statuary she saw on a former ideal visit to Washington.] “It is carved,” she continued. “Why—they are”—“They are what?” I

demanded. "Why, I am trying to see." "What do they look like? Do they resemble lions?" "Yes," she replied—"they are lions—*bronzed* lions." I had spoken the word lions too hastily; but her own unaided discovery, that the noble pair of lions *dormant* guarding the portals of Mr. Ray's house, were of *bronze*, rendered this incident the most striking development in the case, thus far.' pp. 24, 25.

We hope the reader will remark how ingeniously the Colonel contrives, throughout the course of his examination, to elicit correct replies from his companion. He either directly, or indirectly, puts the answer into her mouth, and then looks around amazed, and wonders that others are not amazed too. He scarcely allows her, neither is she inclined, to make an independent remark. Everything that she says seems to be drawn from her, and may readily be inferred from the observations or allusions of her conductor.

In the case of the lions, a remark or two occurs. The Colonel observes his companion feeling about as for something. He supposes she is feeling for lions, because he has taken her before Mr. Ray's house. She is so great a blunderer as not to know what is directly under her eyes, except that they are something *carved*! She begins to tell, but hesitates and stammers, evidently waiting to be helped out of the difficulty. At this painful juncture her conductor shouts in her ears, *lions*, and all at once, as by a miracle, her doubts are removed. She pronounces them *lions*. Not only this, but, after a moment's hesitation, she declares them *bronzed* lions, thinking, very justly, that no man would be very likely to select the living animals to guard his portals. Nor is it probable, that she had ever seen the images of lions before people's doors, which were not "bronzed."

Our author and his friend then agreed to visit the Astor House:

'I then walked with her to the broad portal, where she rather shrunk back.

"I do not like to go up those stairs, there are so many men standing there," [remarked Miss B.] p. 28.

The Colonel is again amazed, and asks, "What form of expression could convey a more accurate description of the entrance to that establishment, and of the large groups of men standing there at all hours?" But does it require the development of a new faculty to enable a person in Providence to declare "many men" to be standing near the entrance of such a public-house as Astor's, particularly at the hour at which this

declaration seems to have been made, which, so far as we can form an estimate from some data with which the Colonel furnishes us, must have been near the period of dining? We are sorry to pluck laurels from the brows of our heroine, but duty requires it.

Again, Col. Stone took his friend to see what he told her was "the old Mechanics' Hall."

'She stopped, and looking up, her attention was suddenly arrested by some object of interest.

"What are you looking at, Miss Brackett?" I inquired.

"I was looking at that carved work," she replied.

"What is it?"

"That is what I am trying to study. They are like figures*—but you are in such a hurry—I am trying to find out its meaning."

Those who are acquainted with the premises we were examining, will doubtless recollect the sculptured group above the cornice of Mechanics' Hall, on the Park Place front—the figure of Charity dispensing her favors to several orphan children. It was this group that attracted the attention of my somnoloquial companion.' pp. 28, 29.

Now, with all the deference in the world to the Colonel's better judgment, we would inquire, how he knew his companion was looking at the "sculptured group" alluded to? Is there no other "carved work, like figures," on or about Mechanics' Hall, except the group in question? Were there no "*bronzed lions*" in sight, that she might have mistaken for *carved* work? Again: Is carved work such as she may have seen, so uncommon a thing on public buildings like Mechanics' Hall, as to render the coincidence of Miss B's declaration with fact so *very* remarkable?

After all these wonderful incidents, and some others of trifling importance, which we have omitted, Col. Stone arrived with his "somniaquial companion" to the door of his own house. He sent her into the kitchen, in advance of himself, "to see what the servants were about." She returned, and said she saw "two white women, with a negress." On being inquired of, what they were about, "she said she did not like to tell."

Here the Colonel was once more amazed, but for a different reason from what he had been previously. He observed that

* In reference to the words, "they are like figures," Col. Stone remarks, at the end of his letter, "My impression is strong that Miss B. said something equivalent, if not those words; but on reflection I cannot recall the exact phrase she used."

his companion was making all sorts of blunders, which even *he* could not metamorphose into truth. How was he to account for it? Fertile in resources, when his friend got into trouble, he suddenly thought of an explanation. "It struck me that she had by mistake entered the wrong house!" The Colonel supposes she had gone into the house opposite his own, though he acknowledges that there was no black woman engaged there at that time. Convinced of the mistake, he called her out and bade her to try again. She went into his own kitchen then, and said she saw two servants, a cook, a middle aged woman, and a young girl. "In a word, she gave very accurate descriptions of the persons of two servants who had been left in charge of the house;" though we are not told in what this accuracy consisted, farther than has been stated. She however said, that the girl's frock was "a dark purple sprig," when it was "blue, with a small light flower." She said, too, that they were "not doing much of anything;" and that they were *not* washing. It turned out, however, that they were busy, and *were* washing. But, in justice, it should be mentioned, that she acknowledged "she could not see clearly," because "the room was rather dark."

We hope the reader will remark how indefinite and how general Miss B's observations and answers commonly are. If she is required, from the nature of the case, to be particular, she either blunders, or declares "that you can see as well as she," or that "the room is too dark," or "she does not like to tell," and so on. By the way, this is the first time we ever heard that spirits could not see in the dark! We should think, that a class of persons who can see through the back of the head, or through brick walls with the eyes bandaged, or look into a man's body, or read the contents of a letter consisting of "several envelopes," and "sealed with seven wafers and two seals," without breaking the seals, ought not to complain of being unable to see in a room light enough for kitchen work.

Col. Stone now conducted his companion from the kitchen to the drawing-room.

'I attempted to direct her attention to several pictures, [says he,] but in her imagination she ran across the room to the center-table, standing in one corner, expressing her admiration of the books with which it was covered. She glanced at several, speaking of the beautiful pictures with which they were filled. With one of them she seemed to be most of all pleased. I asked her what it was. She replied, "Ill—Illustrations of the Bible." I had not thought of the table or books until she thus called my attention to them.' p. 35.

Here again mark the power of our author's imagination, his gallantry as a gentleman, and his unconquerable love of the marvelous. He directs her attention to the pictures. She talks wide of the mark. She is in error in every particular. *Illustrations of the Bible?* He concludes, that she must have entered "the wrong house." Immediately his thoughts are directed to the center-table, where he recollects the book named is lying, and where he finds Miss B. looking at the pictures!

Thus, if our somnambulist's remarks do not apply to the subject in hand, her conductor always succeeds in finding something to which they will apply!

Miss B. continued to remark upon the book, a little more particularly than she was accustomed to do—consequently blundering:

"I saw just such a one, the other day, at Mr. Farley's, in Providence, only the cover of that was brown, and this is green."

On returning home [adds Col. S.] I found that she was in error with regard to the cover—it being brown instead of green. But by the side of it [mark it, reader] lay the "Gems of Beauty," in green morocco, and another Keepsake bound in the same color.' pp. 35, 36.

We have thus far followed our author very closely in his "course of examination." We have done so for the purpose of showing the reader the spirit with which the examination is conducted, and of the sort of evidence which is deemed sufficient proof of the extraordinary powers for which search is made. The most trifling coincidence between the declarations of Miss B. and fact, are sufficient to satisfy her guide; and even when there is no coincidence, according to any fair construction of language, the excited imagination of the Colonel is very sure to make one. The pure suggestions of his own fancy are perpetually mistaken for realities. He rolls up his eyes on the most trifling occasions, and when the vividness of his own ideas is his only apology. The vaguest expressions answer the purpose of the most minute description. His own quick and accurate conceptions, assisted by extraordinary fertility of mind, make up every deficiency—carry him safely over every difficulty. Borne forward by such powerful aids, he is not only strong enough to help himself out of trouble, but is adequate to the most trying emergencies of his erring and sometimes awkward friend.

As to the occurrences which have so turned our author's head, nothing that has yet happened exceeds or even equals

in strangeness the ordinary tricks of jugglers and mountebanks. From what has been said, we trust the reader will conclude with us, that our author is wholly unfit to carry on and complete the inquiry which he has begun. No person, in the excited state of the imagination of which we have given so many illustrations, is qualified to go on with any investigation, much more, with one of the kind under notice. While in such a condition of mind, we cannot trust the judgment, nor even the senses of any man—such a man cannot state properly even the simplest matters of fact. Even in spite of some tolerably honest efforts to the contrary, he will not only discolor and exaggerate, but state that which never happened and never can happen. He will see strange sights and hear strange noises, and confound fancy and fact in every possible manner. He lives in a world of apparitions, and his language is the gibberish of departed spirits. In truth, he is in a state of temporary monomania, and is to be so regarded, and corresponding allowances made for all that he says. These considerations we hope the reader will bear in mind, while we accompany our author in his farther adventures with Miss B. We left them, it will be recollected, in the drawing-room.

We have seen, that Col. Stone did not succeed in his first attempts to make his magnetized friend look at the pictures. But his efforts were finally crowned with success. "Reaching up her hands she took down a small picture." She was asked if it was a "fruit piece." "'Oh yes,' was the reply." "This was correct," the Colonel mentions in another place. But she now obstinately refused to be farther questioned. She only spoke in exclamations, or in gestures, or contortions of countenance, which, by the way, her conductor always understood to signify her comprehension of the objects with which he presented her. At this critical time, when the girl seems once more to have entered a room somewhat *too dark*, and to have needed assistance which even Col. Stone could not afford, Dr. Capron (who appears to have been standing by all this time) came forward with the following explanation, or *plan of relief*. He said that whenever Miss B. "was looking at an object with, as she supposed, another person," she would not reply to questions requiring answers which were obvious to the questioner, "believing either that they were not seriously put, or that the questioner was quizzing or sporting with her."

'Dr. Capron again spoke to me, [continues our author,] of which circumstance, however, she was evidently unconscious; and remarked,

that when I had proceeded as far as I wished, he would come suddenly upon her, as if on a visit to New York, and after taking her from me, she would without doubt freely relate to him all that had taken place between her and myself.' p. 38.

With this understanding, our author proceeded to show his guest the pictures. For the sake of illustration, we will give the different cases together, although one or two of them were prior to Dr. C's last remarks :

'I asked her to examine the painting over the side-board. She looked at it some time, and expressed great pleasure at its beauty.

My next experiment was with another picture, of a very peculiar character. "Miss Brackett," said I, "there is a picture in the other room hanging over the couch, which I value highly. I wish you would look at it." Miss B. looked with great interest upon the picture, [but] I could elicit no description from her.' pp. 36, 37.

Our author now asked Miss B. to walk into the library, concerning which she remarked, that it was long and narrow, and wanted air—"exactly the criticisms upon my private 'den,' made by all my waking friends."

'I then asked her to look at the upper painting above the fire-place. She looked and became instantly pensive. Presently her bosom heaved with sighs. I asked her what she thought of it. She said she did not like to look at it any more. I then requested her to look at the picture below. She did so, and in a moment was absorbed with curious interest. But, as before, she would not describe it to me, farther than to say it was the portrait of a dark colored man ; but she brought her hand round her head, as much as to say there was something peculiar about the head. I then again directed her attention to the upper picture. She immediately became pensive, and affected as before. The experiment was repeated several times, until in contemplating the upper picture she sobbed and wept. "Well," said I, "if that picture affects you so much, you need look at it no more. I have here a picture in this drawer which I prize highly, and will show it you." Saying which, I opened the drawer, and handed her the picture. She (in imagination, of course) took the picture, and observed in a whisper, as if talking to herself, "Oh, it's a miniature." I asked her what she thought of it? She replied it was very beautiful—but would not describe it, for the reasons I have already mentioned.' pp. 39, 40.

It was now proposed that Dr. Capron should "resume his sway" over his patient, "for the purpose of the suggested cross examination, as to what she had seen." He therefore *willed* Miss B. again into his own possession, so that he might converse with her.

‘He took her by the hand, and the following scene ensued :—

“Ah, Loraina, are you here?”

“Why, Doctor, how do you do? When did you come from Providence?”

“I have just arrived.”

“I am glad to see you.”

“And I am very glad to see you. When did you come to New York?” pp. 40, 41.

After some conversation of this sort, the Doctor asked her what pictures she saw at Col. Stone's house?

What was the painting over the sideboard? “It was a lake, with mountains around it. I thought it very beautiful,” she replied.

“Such is the fact, [adds Col. S.] The picture is a charming mountain landscape, the scene being a beautiful lake among the Catskill mountains, by Hoxie.”

The Doctor then inquired what the picture was, that was hanging over the couch. She answered thus :

“Oh, it was a curious picture. It represents three Indians sitting in a hollow tree, which looks as though it had been dug out on purpose. And the tree is filled with marks?” [Hieroglyphics.]

This is the most wonderful reply we had had yet, [remarks our author.] The picture is a composition landscape, by Hoxie, containing the portrait of the decaying trunk of an enormous sycamore tree. The artist has introduced a group of three Indians, and has likewise traced a number of hieroglyphics within the open trunk. These hieroglyphics are seldom noticed by visitors, unless specially pointed out.’ p. 42.

The Doctor then asked the somnambulist what pictures she saw in the library.

‘Here she again became affected, as she replied—“One of them was Christ in his agony, with a crown of thorns.”’

This reply was astounding. The picture is an admirable copy of the *Ecce Homo*, by Guido. It had only been sent home a week before, and I had cautiously avoided mentioning it to my most intimate friends present at this extraordinary interview, until she thus proclaimed it.

“What other picture did you see in the library?”

“There was a portrait of an Indian chief.”

This was another wonderful reply. The picture is an admirable copy, by Catlin, of a capital portrait of Brant, the great Mohawk warrior, which has recently been procured.

“How was he dressed?”

“Why, I can hardly describe it. His head was shaved, and I don't

know exactly whether there was any hair left on or not. There was something on the top, but I could hardly tell whether it was hair."

This description was very accurate. The knot on the crown is the scalp-lock; and the war-paint around it, and something like a ribbon tying it, would render it doubtful to a superficial observer, unacquainted with Indian customs and costumes, whether there was any hair there or not.

"Was there no other picture in the library?"

"Oh yes: he took out of a drawer a miniature."

"Did it resemble the large picture?"

"I thought it did, somewhat."

"How was it dressed?"

"It was a very handsome picture, and had a cap and plumes."

This was another wonderful reply. The picture in question is a very beautiful miniature likeness of Brant, composed by N. Rogers, from two pictures of the chief, taken when he was a young man, and first in London, in his court dress. The picture lies yet in the drawer, where it was seen and described by Miss Brackett—blind—previously unconscious of its existence—and two hundred miles off when she saw it.' pp. 43, 44.

In addition to considerations which have already been offered in anticipation of the preceding cases, we have a few remarks to offer in this place.

The case before us, in reference to these last five pictures, stands thus:

Col. Stone, the author of a letter to Dr. Brigham, on Animal Magnetism, says that he was lately at Providence, and that while there he saw a young woman, who, WHILE SHE WAS YET PRESENT AND CONVERSING WITH HIM, visited New York, and saw and described accurately sundry things which she had never before seen, and even of the existence of which she was totally ignorant.*

This declaration, we are bold to say, contains an untruth. It embraces a proposition which is incredible, contradictory, and absurd, and therefore cannot be true. It contains more than a miracle. The testimony of no man and no set of men, can authorize us to believe it. Here we take our stand, and defy the world to drive us from it. We feel bound to enter into no explanation, nor even to attempt to reconcile the

* Perhaps Col. Stone will have it, (for his statements are various and inconsistent,) that only Miss B's soul or spirit visited New York. If such is his pleasure, he involves himself in a new dilemma, and that too without having extricated himself from the old one. What would have become of Miss B's soul or spirit had she been waked by her magnetizer while her *better* part was still flirting in Broadway with Col. Stone?

alleged contradictory facts. There is error somewhere, but no one has a right to require us to find it. However, of our own free will, we will suggest some sources of *possible* error.

1. It is *possible*, that Col. Stone has attempted to play off a ridiculous hoax, or a known imposture upon the world. We have, throughout our remarks, endeavored to regard the Colonel as believing in his own story, or, in other words, as a honest man; but who is authorized to require even this concession in his favor?

2. It is *possible*, that he has mistaken a dream for reality. Who dare deny this? If we ourselves had seen what he claims to have witnessed, we should prefer considering the wonder as a vision of the night, rather than a waking reality.

3. It is *possible*, that he is afflicted with that species of derangement of mind called monomania, and that the whole, or a part, of what he claims to have seen in Providence, is but a fiction of a crazed imagination. Perhaps his case, and that of his companions and friends, are true cases of this disease, and will finally be proved to be so. We have known epidemics of unquestionable madness, hardly less strange. Witness the instance of the Irvingites, of the Mormons, of the followers of Matthias, and of certain communities of Perfectionists, all in our own day, *to say nothing of the believers in Maria Monk*.

4. It is *possible*, that the girl had been in New York, previous to her interview with Col. Stone, (although she asserted the contrary,) and had examined the position and character of the pictures described. It is possible, too, quite possible, that she may have obtained her information from her physician, or from some accomplice or friend, even though one of the paintings which she described had not been in Col. Stone's house but a week, and another had been only recently procured. All this we declare to be much more than possible, although our author professes to *know* to the contrary. Col. Stone, it should be recollected, was *invited* to Providence. He was therefore expected, and it is fair enough to presume, that preparations were made to receive him; among which preparations may have been a successful inquiry concerning the Colonel's household arrangements, and especially his pictures, of which he was known to be fond, and about which he would be likely, therefore, to inquire, in the course of the expected examination. Information regarding things and changes which were new, (regarding the two or three pictures, for instance, which had been recently procured,) would, of course, be most anxiously sought. All the knowledge of the pictures

which the somnambulist proved herself to have, was probably, at that time, in the possession of scores, or hundreds, and most of it of thousands, including many persons, doubtless, in Providence. Therefore, the preparatory information laid up for Miss B., may not have been very difficult to obtain.

The refusal of Miss B. to answer questions, on the unsatisfactory plea, that her questioner was sporting with her, is, to say the least, a suspicious circumstance. The same may be said respecting her pretension of being unable to see in a dark room. It looks as though she had forgotten her lesson, and was waiting for Dr. Capron to remind her of it.

These suggestions we throw out. It is not our design or our business to do more.

5. It is *possible*, that Col. Stone may have omitted some material circumstance in his statement, which might, was it known, throw light upon the case. This we think highly probable. We have seen the extent of his faith, his propensity to embellish, and his anxiety to exhibit his companion to the best advantage. In his excited state of mind, he would be very likely to omit many things, which he, in the simplicity of his heart and in the fullness of his belief, supposed to be trifling incidents of no interest or importance. He thinks he recorded everything "essential;" but a man's memory is sometimes treacherous, particularly as to matters which are thought of no moment at the time. Besides, his narrative was not written until several days (thirteen) after the events which it describes—a sufficiently long period for trifles to fade or vanish from the memory.

There is one way in which we think it not unlikely, that Col. Stone may himself have given the information with which Miss B. so much surprised him. He supposed, that Miss B. could hear no voice but his own, after the Doctor had "clothed him with the power of enjoying her exclusive company;" nor even his own, unless addressed directly to herself. This he believed without a particle of evidence, apparently because he was told to do so. On the supposition of this ignorance on the part of his companion, he proceeded throughout the examination. He frequently conversed with those about him on the manner and objects of the inquiry, without any fear of being overheard by Miss B. He was thus thrown off his guard. Did he not in this way communicate the very knowledge which afterwards so astounded him? If he did so, the fact of course would not have been noticed in his letter, because it was not a part of his interview with Miss B.,

and, as he supposed, had no concern with it. It was regarded as not "essential to a full illustration" of his subject.

Thus we have shown many possible ways (we might have pointed out others) in which Col. Stone may have been mistaken, either of which is many thousand times, and some one of which many million times more probable than the monstrous absurdity which the Colonel asserts. This we say, notwithstanding our author so often gives us his word, that there was no collusion, trick, fraud, or deception, in the case. We are unwilling to reject the word of any credible and honorable man; but when it is given for that which cannot, in the nature of things, be true, we must pause before receiving it. Are we not entitled to do so?

It appears plainly, then, that Col. Stone's *proof* is imperfect and defective. And can *defective* proof prove a contradiction? Let the world judge whose position is strongest, the Colonel's or our own.

The Doctor now again transferred (willed) his patient into the hands of Col. S. "Quick as a flash," says the Colonel, "we were restored to the place and position occupied at the moment of the Doctor's intervention." They then visited Trinity Church, where Miss B. astonished her guide, as usual, but nothing occurred worthy of particular notice. Afterwards, our author took her back again to his own house, and asked her to look at a picture in his "*snuggery*," a breakfast-room. She smiled, but would not describe it. The Doctor now told him, that if he would charge her to remember what she saw, and tell him when she waked, she would do so. The Colonel did as he had been instructed, and when she was awaked soon after by Dr. Capron, "by the peculiar process of Animal Magnetism, together with a few brushes of the hand over the forehead," our author inquired of her what she saw in his "basement room."

'She laughed outright, as she replied, "It was a funny looking fellow pulling a cat's ear."

This was another remarkable answer. The picture in question is an old and admirable painting, recently purchased by my friend, the Rev. J. C. Brigham, and loaned to me. Its existence, I am perfectly confident, was unknown to any of the party present but myself; and the subject, that of a sly, mischievous fellow, full of wicked laughter, as he is teasing some antiquated lady, by pulling or pinching the ears of her favorite tabby!' p. 49.

We have extracted this case for the purpose of giving the reader all Col. Stone's *facts*. We have nothing to say regard-

ing it, in addition to what has been said concerning other cases like it.

Col. Stone's visit to New York occupied "nearly four hours." In returning to Providence, his "most interesting companion" chose again, that they should "fly." The Colonel, of course, acceded to the proposal, and waited on her as politely as he had done before. After their return, Miss B. was waked in the manner alluded to.

On leaving Providence, Col. Stone determined on one more experiment, to test the powers of Miss B. He left a note "carefully folded, so as to preclude the possibility of reading it, by the natural sight, without opening, and sealed it with seven wafers, and two seals of wax, with my own private signet." When the note was returned, "the seals were unbroken, and exactly in the condition I had left them, with the answer written on the outside." The note, the latter part of it printed, was as follows :

'The following is the title, equally quaint and amusing, of a book which was published in England in the time of Oliver Cromwell: "*Eggs of Charity, layed by the Chickens of the Covenant, and boiled by the waters of Divine Love. Take ye and eat.*"

I subjoin the answer, sent by Miss B. through an intimate friend :

"The following is a title, equally amazing (or amusing) and quaint, of a book published in England in the time of Oliver Cromwell :
Eggs of Charity.

Miss B. does not know whether the word is amazing or amusing. Something is written after the "eggs of charity," which she cannot make out." p. 53.

Col. Stone gives another similar case, (which he, however, did not witness,) in which Miss B. read a note, "composed of several envelopes," without breaking the seals, which was sent from Troy, N. Y., by Mr. Stephen Covill, for the purpose of exercising her powers.

Thus we have been determined to give our author a fair hearing. We have presented everything which is at all important, that his letter contains.

With regard to the sealed notes, we have room but for a few remarks. The fact stated is improbable, to say the least, in the highest degree, but not so palpably absurd and contradictory as some other parts of the narrative. The Colonel, of course, is confident, that there was "no foul" play in the case; but we have little doubt, that there was, notwithstanding this confident declaration. We, perhaps, need not mention ways

in which there may have been mistake ; but we would ask the reader to notice the following suspicious circumstances :

1. Nobody appears to have seen Miss B. read either of the notes.

2. Col. Stone's note was prepared and left in a great hurry, when appearances, perhaps, were not so familiar as they might have been, had the thing been done more deliberately. It was probably left when the wafers were still fresh, and afforded no security. Respecting the private seal, which could not be counterfeited, we have never seen it, and do not know. However, there are more persons that can prepare and apply counterfeit seals, than can read notes in the manner that Mis B. is affirmed to have done.

3. Miss B. was obliged to take Mr. Covill's note to bed with her before reading it. So says Col. Stone. The Providence experimenters say, that she took it into a dark room alone. Why could she not read it before company, and in the presence of daylight ?

4. The Providence experimenters,* in the case of Mr. Covill's note, and in an account published before the note had been returned to Mr. C., and before its contents were known, except from the declaration of Miss Brackett, give us the particulars (as it were in a moment of forgetfulness) about the manner in which the note was prepared and folded, apparently for the purpose of showing the difficulty of the exploit ; and this, when there seems to have been no honest way in which they could have obtained their information ! They say, that the note was placed "between two thick cards, folded in a deep blue sheet of paper," sealed with his own seal and a number of wafers, and the whole put into a large sheet !

5. In the case of both the notes, the somnambulist pretended, that she could not read the whole ; when it is obvious, that if she could read a part of such notes, she could read all.

In an appendix to the work before us, there is an extract from the notes to the book already referred to in a note. The

* See a work recently published in Providence, entitled "Practical Instruction in Animal Magnetism, by J. P. F. Deleuze, translated by Thomas C. Hartshorn," with notes by the translator. We say nothing of the book. The notes contain additional statements concerning the Providence somnambulists, in which the names of Dr. Capron, Dr. Brownell, Dr. Webb, &c., are introduced as so many vouchers for truth. They ought to be bound up in the same volume with Col. Stone's Letter. Regarding some of the most wonderful of the *facts* which these notes contain, it is alledged, that they are "substantiated beyond the possibility of a doubt;" and it is farther added, as a most satisfactory disposal of the question of *proof*—"as may be learned by any one passing through Providence." What an extinguisher to the hopes of cavilers and sceptics !

extract relates chiefly to a female, a patient of Dr. Brownell, who, while in a state of somnambulism, was requested to examine another patient of the Doctor, at the distance of a mile and a quarter, (who was supposed to be affected with a diseased liver,) and to "tell what the disease was." She looked over the man's internal organs, described some of them, (though she had never seen them, or plates of them, or heard them described before,) and said, that the liver was not diseased, but that the spleen was enlarged. Ten days after this, the man died. Sixteen physicians, says Dr. Brownell, besides himself, examined the body after death, and declared they could discover no enlargement of the spleen. "I then opened the body, (says Dr. B.,) and, to the utter astonishment of the physicians present, found the spleen so enlarged as to weigh *fifty-seven* ounces. Its usual weight is from *four* to *six* ounces." "No other disease was perceptible."

Concerning this case, we have only to say, that if its statements are true, we cannot have a very high opinion of the Providence physicians. If Dr. Brownell and his sixteen associates could not, either before or after death, discover an enlarged spleen, ten or twelve times its natural size, and weighing fifty-seven ounces, they certainly ought not to have published their shame.

That there may not be some truth in some parts of Col. Stone's narrative is more than we dare say. Some portions of it are credible; but the error and extravagance which make up the largest and most essential part of it, throw an air of doubt over the whole. That the Animal Magnetism of Providence is a most miserable delusion, there can be no question; and that another generation will look upon it as such, we as confidently believe. We have all heard the story of the far-famed "Salem Witchcraft." Animal Magnetism is no more respectable. It rests on no better evidence, is sanctioned by no higher authority, and has hitherto kept no better company. The unfortunate beings who, in either case, have fully illustrated its power, have been weak, diseased, nervous, and irritable females, who sometimes have been of questionable honor. Its dupes have almost ever been fools, and certain credulous gentlemen, of shattered mind and memory, its professors mountebanks, and its instigators knaves. Its progress has hitherto been the progress of credulity, imposture, guilt, and shame.

P. S. Since the foregoing article was written, the "science" of Animal Magnetism has received a very effectual exposure,

in a pamphlet by C. F. Durant, who, by seemingly aiming to establish a theory of his own on the subject, was enabled to unfold some of its mysteries and account for its alledged facts. We presume, that any farther notice of its pretensions, for the present at least, will be thought entirely unnecessary ; and had the exposure in question been previously published, we might have saved ourselves the trouble of preparing the above.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES.

Confessions of a French Catholic Priest, &c. : Edited by S. F. B. Morse, A. M., Professor, &c. *New York: John S. Taylor.*

WE have no clew to guide us in determining who is the author of this volume ; but in the absence of this, we are furnished with the assurance, that he is known to the editor, Prof. S. F. B. Morse, and that the work has been subjected to his revision. Such a guarantee was needful, not so much on account of the facts which it contains, as for the reason, that the present age is one given to imposture and credulity. These pages bear the marks of truth, and in them are depicted the struggles of a conscientious spirit against the soul-contaminating tendencies of a system which, for its artfulness and its knowledge of the corrupt inclinations of human nature, may well be termed the masterpiece of the arch-enemy of man.

From the days of Pascal and his admirable Provincial Letters to the present time, there have been individuals well acquainted with the wicked casuistry and the slavish bondage of Popery, who have not hesitated to expose its foul abominations and its dangerous influences. But a little of its real vileness has been or can be spread before the christian public ; yet enough is known to show, that it seeks, by an unnatural warfare against the best affections of humanity, to debase the soul, which, aided by its social state, and ennobled by a participation in the divine nature, was created for better aims and purposes. We speak of the Roman Catholic religion, where it exerts its appropriate influence, and its true tendencies are brought out into operation by the predominating strength which it has acquired over the minds of men. We might mention the effects of this influence in Spain, as depicted by Blanco White, or in Italy, by Scipio Ricci, and in France, by numerous writers. We are not yet disposed to believe, that the same evils, to their

full extent, are realized, and we would indulge the hope, that such will never be the case in our own beloved land. Still, it is not amiss to be aware of the nature of its insidious attacks, and be armed as we may need against its deceitful wiles. Candid, well written exposures of this system of superstition and guilt, such as do not manifestly aim to cherish in us a persecuting spirit, are well adapted to meet the exigencies of the times. Truth cannot harm us, nor can it be deemed irrelevant to those who have a part to act in promoting their country's prosperity, if they seek accurately to ascertain the various systems which go to make up the mass of influence that is operating to lessen or enlarge it. It is with such views, that we have taken up the volume before us. It does not, indeed, contain many new things, but it does contain materials for subjects of reflection; and the story, while no apparent exaggeration characterizes it, yet possesses the charms and interest of a romance. Our limits do not allow us to go into detail, nor can we even give a sketch of the principal incidents, without breaking in upon the connection, and we should be unable to convey any adequate view of the work, were we to attempt it. Suffice it to say, that by his position as a French Catholic priest, he became acquainted with enough of the evils of the system to lead him to break from its sway. Most feelingly does he portray his temptations, and the struggles of a virtuous spirit surrounded by everything calculated to make him faithless to his vows; but, if we may believe him, he need not charge his conscience with their violation, till he at once released himself from their power. We wish our limits allowed us to make a few quotations; but we must refer our readers to the work itself, and we can assure them they will find in it much to awaken their sympathy and excite their interest.

A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands, with remarks upon the Natural History of the Islands, Origin, Languages, Traditions, and Usages of the Inhabitants. By JOHN WILLIAMS, of the London Missionary Society. First American Edition. *D. Appleton & Co. New York.*

THE islands in the South Sea will ever stand on the page of missionary records, as the scene of unwonted exertion and signal success. Faith might almost have seemed ready to expire, amid the difficulties and discouragements which, year after year, crowded upon the feeble band who were engaged in fulfilling the divine command of carrying the gospel to the perishing heathen. Capture on their way, apostasies, wars, and distresses of a peculiar character, followed in quick suc-

cession; but the persevering devotedness of those who remained true to their trust, was at length rewarded by the abolition of idolatry and the establishment of the christian religion in the very places which had been marked by the bloody and degrading rites of superstition and sin. The work before us deserves a more extended notice than we can now give it. It is a faithful exhibition of the progress of events, from the first voyage of the Duff to the complete triumph of the gospel in the isles of the Pacific; and no christian, we are sure, can read it without a deeper conviction of the excellency and power of that word of life in which he has believed, and of the sure ground of confidence there is in the promises of a covenant-keeping God. The information which it contains, respecting the manners and customs and languages of the natives, is most valuable, and the whole work possesses a charm which may well recommend it to the perusal of all. Those who are fond of watching the operations of heroic enterprise, may here find ample materials for admiration. It has the further advantage, too, of proceeding from one who has himself been on the spot, and borne his part in some of the perils and other events which he describes. The volume is adorned with numerous well executed wood cuts, representing a variety of interesting subjects; and the whole appearance of the work is highly creditable to the press from which it has issued. We must leave it now, but we are not certain, that we shall not take it up more fully hereafter.

The Young Man's Aid to Knowledge, Virtue, and Happiness. By Rev. HUB-
BARD WINSLOW, Pastor of Bowdoin-street Church, Boston. *Boston: D. K.
Hitchcock, Whipple & Damrell. 1837.*

WE have not neglected to notice this work before, because we think lightly of it. On the contrary, we deem it a valuable accession to the many works written for the benefit of young men. It embraces a great variety of topics, and most of them too of the highest importance. The standard of character which it presents and attempts to enforce, is an elevated one. It may be read with profit by all; but especially the class of persons for whom it is designed may find in it hints and instruction which they will do well to treasure up in their memories, and rules of conduct, which, if adopted into practice, will tend to render them better prepared for all the scenes of social life, and better men. The style is clear, and often forcible, and the argument is well calculated to awaken attention to the oracles of God and the proprieties of life.

INDEX

TO THE

NINTH VOLUME OF THE

QUARTERLY CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

AGENTS for benevolent societies, necessity and qualifications of, 255—263.

Aglaophamus of Lobeck, review of, 478—520: Warburton, Starck, and Onvartoff, 479: two opposite tendencies in writers, 480, 481: opinions of Lobeck and De Sacy, 482: proofs, offices of the priesthood, 483—of the hierophant, 484—question of degrees, 486—*exoteric* and *esoteric*, 487—argument for degrees from Theon, Olympiodorus, 488, 489: figurative use of terms denoting mysteries examined, 490: veneration felt for the mysteries, good derived from them, 494: Plato, 495: terms *mystae* and *epoptae*, &c., 497: Clement, 498—500: mysteries of Ceres, 501—doctrine of the soul, 502: Homer allegorically interpreted, 506, physical, 507, metaphorical, 508, historical, Enmerus, 509, his view of the principal mysteries, 514: Eleusinian, 515, Bacchic, 516, Phrygian, 517: THE GREAT MYSTERY, 518: later condition, 519: their abolition, 520.

Animal magnetism, report on reviewed, 434—466: statement of principles of reasoning, 434—439: meaning, 440: Franklin's report, 441: magnetical somnambulism, *transport of the senses*, &c., 442: M. Poyen's translation, 443: examination of the report: commission, mode of magnetizing, 444, 445: class of persons—subjects, 446: objections, 447: cases described; objections stated, 449: *clairvoyance*, 456—*prévision*, 457: critical remarks, 460.

— Stone's letter on, examined—Col. Stone well prepared to believe, 647; visits Providence, 649; inquiries made; Miss Brackett, 650; particularity of her case, 651; interview with Miss B., 652: experiments, 653: magnetic visit to New York, 654: incidents, &c., 655, 656; visit to Mechanics' Hall, to Col. Stone's house, 657; blunders, 658; pictures, Col. Stone's imagination, 659, 660; explanation, 661, 662; more than a miracle to be believed in, 663: possibilities, 664, 665; imperfect proof, 666: experiments with sealed letters, 667: explanation and suspicious circumstances, 668: Providence physicians, 669.

Apocalypse, on the character of—Is it a drama? arguments of Eichhorn, 570: answer to them, 571, 572.

Authority of reason in theology, 151—162.

Bangs, Dr., his misrepresentations noticed and corrected, 171, 173.

Bush, Prof.—his theory on the millenium stated and refuted, 358—371: the dragon a symbol of paganism; critical examination and historical facts, 364, 365—his view of the 1000 years literal, 367; views of the Apocalypse, 368, 369; objections, 370.

Catholic clergyman, confessions of a, 670.

Children—religious education of, 1—importance; early accountable, 2; early capacity of becoming pious, 3; advantages great, more inquisitive, susceptible of impressions, sinful propensities fewer and feebler, 4, 5; no long-cherished errors or prejudices, 5; future influence, 6, 7: the times, 7, 9: means of effecting the object—parental influence and instruction, discipline and example, 9, 10: sabbath school, 10, 11, common school, 12, mode of benefiting, 13—16.

Christianity an essential want of human nature, 573: our moral ruin; our misery as sinners, 574, 575; our desires for good, 576; our dependence on God for life and the blessings of time, 577; social condition, 578; prospects, for eternity, 579: illustrations, 580: French revolution, 581, 582: necessity of religion, 583.

- Christianity, substantial, the proper basis of christian union, 291; positions stated, 294, 295; objections to this view, 298; relation of the subject to the proper basis of christian fellowship and admission into the church, 299; propriety affirmed and proved, 300—302: means and principles of determining the specific truths—facts and philosophy of revelation, 302—304; God's own estimate the true one, 305; doctrines necessary to salvation, 306; practical relations, 307; summary of the whole argument, 308: the proper tribunal to decide what is substantial christian duty, 309; tests, and their application, 311—313.
- Christian union, review of Dr. Skinner's sermon, 66—93, 289—313; positions defended stated, 79: the true view, propositions stated, 81, 82; illustrations, 83—85; necessity of, 86—90; outward form, 91, 92; remarks, 92, 93; recapitulation of positions, 290, 291.
- Chronological table, 211, 212.
- Clement of Alexandria, extract from, on Egyptian hieroglyphics, 37, 38—on mysteries, 498, 500.
- Colton, Rev. Calvin—his letter to the Christian Spectator, and remarks upon it, 163; complains without cause, &c., 166, 168.
- Commercial distress of the country—causes, and duties, 327: love of riches, 330, 331; luxurious and profligate habits of expenditure, 332—334; want of a true and intelligent patriotism, 335; slavery, &c., 337, 338: duties required, patience, kindness, benevolent spirit, 338—346.
- Communion with the Spirit, 345—357—*all efforts in the cause of God to be directed in full coincidence with the Spirit, according to the true standard of holiness in all its branches*—reasons of adopting such a standard: supremely excellent and worthy, 346; inculcated in the word of God, 348; referred to in all descriptions given of his works, 380: requisites to a concurrence with the Spirit, 351; reasons for entering into full fellowship—shall be made happy, 353, constant, 355, fruitful, 356.
- Comparison of biblical and Egyptian chronologies, 193—212.
- Concio ad Clerum*—unity of the Spirit explained and enforced, 554—570.
- Dactylology* in the instruction of deaf-mutes, 528.
- Deaf and Dumb, instruction of the, 521: historical view, 522—525: De l'Epee, 523: Degerando, 525: Fourth circular of Royal Institution in Paris, 526: systems of instruction, instruments, 527: *dactylology*, 528: Father Vanin, picture-instruction, pantomimic action, passions, 529: sign-language, 531: illustrations, 532: forms, colors, &c., 532: motions, weight, size, 534: consistency, &c., 535: value, materials, uses, mode of construction or manufacture, 536: production, natural changes, seasons, dates, &c., 537: abstractions and classifications, 538, 539: metaphoric pantomime, &c., 540: power of pantomimic action, 541: objections answered, 543: improvements, &c., 544: *mimography*, 545: symbols and grammar, 546: method, 547, illustrations, combinations, 548, 549: derivation, 550, 551: difficulties, &c., 552, 553.
- De Sacy on the mysteries, 482, 483.
- Dissensions among christian brethren, causes of, 554—570: love of power, 555: desire of pre-eminence, 556: reliance on creeds, &c., 556: departure from common sense principles of interpretation, 557: illustrations as to doctrines, 558, 559: neglect to cultivate the *spirit* of the bible, 560: overlooking true principle of christian liberty, 561: evils, truth in danger of being sacrificed and error introduced, 562: trusts liable to be perverted, and character defamed, letter writers, 563, 564: public press perverted, &c., 564: plans of christian benevolence impeded and endangered, the Spirit of God grieved, 568: remedy, cultivate a sense of liability to err, spirit of forgiveness, 566: respect the right of private judgment and cease letter writing, &c., study the 13th chapter of 2d Corinthians, 567: act in view of God's tribunal, practical deductions, separation no cure for disunion, 568: responsibility of ministers of Christ, 569.
- Divine mercies, comparative view of, 134—150—our mercies compared with our deserts, 134; mankind at large, 135; heathen world, 136; Catholic countries, 139, 140; as Americans, 141; our government, enlightened state of society, 142; competence, 143; pure practical humanity of our laws, 144;

as New Englanders, 145, 146; God's goodness in permitting us to live in such a period, 146, 147; truths learned—government for the good of the people, reliance on moral power, certainty of public opinion, efficacy of associations, 148—150.

Egypt, its former and present state, 394, 396—401.

Egyptian hieroglyphics, 29—42: character, key with its application, 30—34: explanation, 35—39: proof, 41.

Finney, C. G., Lectures to Christians, noticed, 341.

Historical and Critical View of Cases in the Indo-European Languages, 109—134: 415—434.

Horapollon,—extract from Hieroglyphicæ, 37, 38.

Jones, Rev. George—his excursions to Cairo, Jerusalem, &c., review of, 393: his emotions in sight of Jerusalem, 403: examines localities of sacred events, results, 405: touching incident connected with the visit to the sepulchre, 407: farewell to Jerusalem, 408.

Laborde,—Journey to Petra, &c., review of, 212—225.

Law and a reverential spirit—relations of, to individual and national prosperity, 380—393: character of this spirit, 382, 383: bearing on the present age, 384: deficiency, 385: tendency to an undue elevation of the individual, no necessary powers of restoration in knowledge, 387: or in the public press, 388: or in systems of education, 389: influence of religious truth, 390.

Maria Monk and her impostures, 263—282: her character, and history of her impostures, 264: arrival at New York, and publication of her book, 269: visits to the nunnery, by Protestants, in 1836, 270: Messrs. Curry and Perkins, certificates, 271, 272: public meeting in Montreal, and resolutions, 373, 374: objections to her credibility, &c., 277—282.

Miscellaneous Notices, 341, 670.

Missionaries—in Jerusalem, trials of, 409—414.

Missionary enterprise, duty of christian sympathy in, 584—597: condition of the A. B. C. F. M., 585—587: nature of christian sympathy, 588: particular grounds of its exercise, *sacrifices, trials, discouragements, consolations, and supports*, 589: grounds of obligation, missionary representatives of American churches, our brethren, fellow-laborers, and pilgrims, 593—596.

Modern Greek dialect, view of, 283—289.

Mohammed Ali, of Egypt, portrait of, 401, 402.

Mysteries, ancient.—Did they teach any of the doctrines of pure religion? 478.

Nevins, Dr., Memoirs of, 17—29: birth and early years, first settlement, 18: afflictions and conduct, 19, illness and death, 20: character, devoted to his work, to his flock, 21: a bible preacher, 22: a natural orator, 23: specimens of his eloquence, no party man, 24—26: sententious writer, and specimens, 27—29: volume of his sermons noticed, 341.

Oriental travelers, 212—255: classes of, described, 243: value of their researches in illustrating the scriptures, 244: examples, 249.

Ouvaroff, essay on the mysteries, his notions, 479.

Party organization and party convention, dangers of, 644—646.

Patriotism—true and intelligent distinguished from false and pretended, 335, 336.

Petra, wonderful fulfillment of providence respecting, 222—242.

Popery, treatment in the United States, 268, 269.

Prophecies, work on, reviewed, 357—379.

Prophecy, Keith's Evidence of, noticed, 377—379.

Prophecy, study of, enforced, 244, 313: benefits, 318: enlargement of mind and comprehensive views of God's government, connection of divine and human agency, 319: effect in rousing the church to labor for the conversion of the world, 320: objections answered, 322, 323: bearing on Roman Catholic controversy, 324.

Prophecy respecting Edom, exposition of, 222—237, argument simple and conclusive, 250.

Presbyterian Church—Revolution in the, 597: review of the Circular Letter,

- Dr. Miller its author, parade of love, &c., 598: arrogant pretensions exposed, 599: history of proceedings in Barnes' and Beecher's case, 606: charge of heresy examined, 601, 602; measures, &c., 603, 604; propositions against error, 605—620: existence of sin, remarks, 605—607: on election, remarks, 608: sin of Adam, remarks, 609: state of infants, remarks, 610: original sin, remarks, 612: imputation, remarks, sufferings and death of Christ, remarks, 613: natural ability, remarks, 615—617: intercession and saving faith, regeneration, 617, 618: God's ability to save, 619: righteousness of Christ, &c., the whole a mere caricature of New England theology, 620: forms of subscription to confessions, 622: Dr. Miller's inconsistency, 623: repeal of plan of union, 624: reasons of abrogation examined, 625: operation of the plan, 626: a compact, 627: confusion and irregularity, 628, 629: true state of the case, excision of the Synods, 633; arguments in defense examined, 634—637: argument against voluntary associations examined, 668: question of duty of the excised Synods, 639—643: trust-deeds and their tenor, 643: danger of party organization, 644: convention in Connecticut, 645.
- Pyramids of Egypt, description of, 395.
- Reason, its authority in theology defined and illustrated, 151—162: must decide as to a revelation, being of a God, 151—154: application to external or internal evidence, 154: determined as to contradiction in doctrines, 155, 156: injurious effects of denial of this power, 160—162.
- Religious education of children, 1—17.
- Sect and denomination, distinction between them, 72.
- Self-deception in religion, 42—64: meaning, 43—45: fact, 45—48: reasons, false views of religion, 48: regard for others' opinion, want of proper attention, feeble powers of discrimination, 50, 51: impatience, 52: wrong views of truth, 53: not necessary, 54: great danger, reasons, pride, love to have the mind at rest, &c., 55—57: interest of others, 58: persons who are deceived, unconscious of lost situation, or of the *evil* of sin, feel not for a dying world, care more for evidence than for serving God, self the great object, solicitous mainly for sect or party, seeking their own happiness as the main object, 58—62: remedy, 63, 64.
- Skinner, Dr. T. H., his views on Christian union, 66—72.
- Smith's Key to the Revelations, characterized, 371—377.
- Spirit of the age viewed in relation to the duties and trials of the christian ministry, 94—109: tendency to worldliness, 94: an enlightened age, 95: ultraism, illustration the wine question, slavery, 97—100: disunion, 100—102: prominence needed to be given to *evangelical* truth, 102, 103: dispensation of the Spirit, 104—106: great religious enterprise, 106—109.
- St. Croix on the mysteries, 482.
- Theology, improvements in, viewed with contempt, its proper limitations, 252—255.
- Todd, Rev. J., his Sabbath School Teacher, review of, 467—478: influence of the gospel, 470: objections, 472: duties of pastors and churches, 473—476.
- Villoison, his theory on the mysteries, 512.
- Warburton, his opinions of the mysteries examined, 479, 486, 503, 512.
- Webster, Noah, LL. D., communication from, remarks on, 431—434.
- Wild Flowers, by a lady, short notice of, 343.
- Williams', John, Missionary Enterprises noticed, 671.
- Winslow, Rev. H., Young Man's Aid, notice of, 672.
- Witness of the Spirit, Wesleyan Methodism on, 169—193: statement of doctrine, proof, 175, 176: objections, denies sufficiency of the bible, &c., 177: unwarranted by the scriptures, 179: contradicted by the scriptures, 179: opposed to scripture view of the operations of the Holy Spirit, 183: influence in a practical view, 184: incompatible with admitted facts of christian experience, 187: views of the nature of regeneration, 196.
- Woodbridge, John, D. D., Practical Religion, noticed, 343.

